

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

THE CONNOISSEUR'S LIBRARY

GENERAL EDITOR: CYRIL DAVENPORT

*This is such a pleasure
to present this to
you Molly.*

MINIATURES




PHILIP THE GOOD
FLEMISH MINATURE ON VELLUM
(Date about 1480)

MINIATURES

BY

DUDLEY HEATH



METHUEN AND CO.

36 ESSEX STREET

LONDON

First Published in 1905

PREFACE

THE literature on miniatures has not been extensive, and the tendency to increase its volume at the present time is sufficient reason for wishing to widen its grasp and survey by a painter's view of the subject.

Dr. Propert's excellent history of the art still retains its place as a scholarly book of reference from the collector's point of view. Unfortunately its limited edition could only reach the very few connoisseurs and collectors who were wise enough to obtain a copy whilst it was still in print. The series of exhibitions which have been held in recent years of the past masters of the art, the formation of two societies for the encouragement of modern miniature painting, and the spread of magazine literature devoted to this subject, have helped the general advancement in taste and knowledge, so that to-day the interest in the historical aspect of this English art of portraiture 'in little' is not confined to the wealthy connoisseurs, but can claim many enthusiasts with less means but no less judgment. Unfortunately, our public national collections are in no way complete records of the best miniaturists of any period, and it is only the exceptionally privileged who have had the opportunity of studying the wealth of fine work that is possessed by many of our oldest families.

The chief object of this volume is to place before the connoisseur—and I use the word in its widest sense—a historical account of the art of miniature which shall be suggestive and stimulating to further study and appreciation, rather than an exhaustive catalogue or an authoritative guide for the specialist.

MINIATURES

Artists are the first to recognise the limited value of so-called authoritative opinions, and this book will have fulfilled a large measure of its usefulness if it assists the enthusiast to become his own authority in the all-important matter of a correct artistic judgment. With this idea in view I have wished to show how inevitably the art of miniature painting reflects the state of vitality that co-exists in other branches of painting, and to what extent it may be said to depend on them for its manners of expression. I have wished to place the individual exponent of the art and the school to which he belongs in their correct relative position from the historical and artistic point of view, without being unduly influenced by fashionable opinion, which is over ready to extol its idol to the sacrifice of other artists. Though, as it is seen, I lay no claim to the autocratic dignity of an absolute authority, I may, without immodesty, claim, both traditionally and practically, a very close and continued connection with the art. It is necessarily through a practical knowledge of its technical side that a really full understanding of the historical development of an art is gained, for theories which are propounded without sufficient technical knowledge have an awkward way of running through facts like water through a sieve. At least it may be said that the subject has been treated here with a sure foundation of practical experience. For this reason, if for no other, I hope this book may contain elements of value alike to the student and the connoisseur, and that those passages which are purely technical may help to elucidate certain principles without which no one can form a truly adequate opinion of a work of art.

In the illustrations, which are an especial feature of this book, will be recognised at once the value of colour. I have selected examples for colour reproduction with the object of showing the characteristics of the four distinct schools flourishing respectively under the Tudor dynasty of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the Stuart dynasty of the seventeenth century, the Georgian of the eighteenth

P R E F A C E

century, and that of the present day. The frontispiece of Philip the Good gives an excellent idea of the scheme and method adopted by the early Flemish portraitists, culminating in the maturer work of Holbein. In the examples of Peter Oliver, Samuel Cooper, John Hoskins, and Nathaniel Dixon we see representative work of the Stuart painters; in Cosway, Plimer, Shelley, and Andrew Robertson, of the Georgian period; and there are four very diverse treatments by modern painters. The best black and white reproduction can only be truly satisfactory to those limited few who have had the advantage of seeing the original. To the majority it is a somewhat dead echo of the thought and feeling of the artist. Even the most careful and elaborate description of the colour scheme may not call up in the mind a correct impression, for the simple reason that colour, which is so often the soul of a painting, is to a great extent subjective, and excites different people in a completely different way. I therefore hope that the colour engravings will inspire the imaginations of those who have not known the originals, and will be a much more valuable record for those who have.

Another very important feature of the illustrations, and one not hitherto sufficiently considered, is the fact that all the reproductions are produced exactly the same size as the original miniatures. To reduce the scale of so small a work of art is to destroy its proper balance in relation to itself and other miniatures. A fine miniature should be designed and fashioned to a certain proportion; its every brush-stroke will be in relation to, and therefore in harmony with, its superficial area. What is admirable in a miniature of two inches might be trivial and finicking in one of four. Below a certain size freedom of handling is wellnigh impossible, and an inch, or even the fraction of an inch, added to a miniature will convert it into a field of wonderful possibilities in this respect. To take an example, the Cosway miniature of Mrs. Butler, if reduced to the average size of the other miniatures by

MINIATURES

this artist, would lose all its free and facile charm, all its tentative feeling for expression. In the same way the Cooper portrait of the Duke of York has added dignity in its slightly larger scale. The realisation of this special feature has of necessity somewhat reduced the number of miniatures it was possible to illustrate, but as it is only the minor painters who have been left out, I believe it will be generally admitted that the gain more than counterbalances the loss. I have, notwithstanding, been able to give illustrations from such rare masters as Clouet, John Bettes, Cornelius Jansen, Nathaniel Dixon, Francis Cleyn, William Prewitt, and Richard Gibson, whose works are probably often wrongly attributed to other painters.

Nathaniel Dixon must surely have painted many miniatures wrongly accredited to others, or left without any name to adorn them. He has, I think, failed to obtain sufficient recognition as one of the brilliant contemporaries of Cooper, and the three illustrations from his work given here will be seen to be full of exceptional character and truthfulness.

It will be noticed that the selections from Cooper's art include some of the finest known miniatures by this master. The selection has been made after considerable thought, with the intention of giving the most complete idea of his marvellous grasp of personality, and of placing him in his rightful position as the greatest exponent of the miniature portrait.

Several of the illustrations in this book are from works reproduced now for the first time, notably the Flemish miniature of Philip the Good, the charming pencil-drawing by Cosway, and the miniature of Charles Heath by Andrew Robertson, and others. Also the coloured reproduction of the famous enamel of the Countess of Dysart by Henry Bone is for the first time attempted in facsimile.

It is my pleasure to offer sincere thanks and acknowledgments to the many collectors and friends who have

P R E F A C E

so graciously assisted me in the study and selection of worthy examples to illustrate this book.

I have the pleasurable reminiscence of Her late Majesty Queen Victoria's graciousness and kindness in granting facilities for my early study of that unrivalled royal collection which owed its inception in its present form to her own enthusiasm, and to-day I am privileged to acknowledge my indebtedness to His Majesty King Edward VII. for his especial permission to include examples from that collection as illustrations.

To His Grace the Duke of Buccleuch I would especially express appreciation of the unrestricted opportunities afforded me for studying the magnificent collection at Montagu House, and of reproducing so many of its unique specimens.

To their Graces the Dukes of Devonshire and Portland I desire to make a like acknowledgment for similar privileges, and I have to regret that lack of space alone prevented me from including examples from Devonshire House and admitted of my using only a few of the historic collection at Welbeck.

To Major-General Sotheby I am most gratefully indebted for the generous courtesy with which every facility was granted both for the study of his interesting collection at Billing and the subsequent loan of many of the most valuable miniatures. Similar expressions of thanks for exceptional help and kindness and unreserved confidence in lending priceless possessions are offered to Sir Tollemache Sinclair, Mr. Henry Drake, Sir Charles Dilke, and others.

My best thanks are also due to the heads of the various libraries and museums from which I have gathered knowledge, for their unfailing helpfulness in placing at my disposal the collections under their control.

Finally, I would wish to express a sense of obligation for invaluable assistance, to those previous writers who, in publishing the fruits of their knowledge, research, and good taste for the benefit of posterity, have afforded

MINIATURES

sources of information without which no book on this subject could possibly be complete. Under this head I must acknowledge my indebtedness to Miss Emily Robertson's most interesting work on Andrew Robertson; Bradley's *Dictionary of Miniaturists*, *The Dictionary of National Biography*, and to Dr. Propert's standard work on this subject. For other books of reference I may refer the reader to the Bibliography.

D. H.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE,	V
INDEX TO PLATES,	xiii
BIBLIOGRAPHY,	xxxv
CHAPTER I. The Origin of the Miniature—Its Growth in the Illuminated Manuscripts of the Eleventh to the Fifteenth Centuries, . . .	
	I
CHAPTER II. The Invention of Printing—Its In- fluence on the Art of the Miniaturists—The Italian School and the Renaissance—Its Influence on other Schools—The French School—The Flemish School,	
	42
CHAPTER III. Holbein and his lesser Contem- poraries—Their Relation to, and Influence on, the Art of English Portrait Miniature, .	
	75
CHAPTER IV. The first Epoch of English Minia- ture Painting—Nicholas Hilliard, Isaac and Peter Oliver, and their Contemporaries, .	
	98
CHAPTER V. The Seventeenth Century English Miniaturists—John Hoskins, Samuel Cooper, Thomas Flatman, Nathaniel Dixon, and their Contemporaries—Miniatures in Plumbago, .	
	118
CHAPTER VI. The Decadence of Miniature Paint- ing in the early Eighteenth Century, . . .	
	142

MINIATURES

	PAGE
CHAPTER VII. The Renaissance of Miniature Painting,	154
CHAPTER VIII. The Art of Richard Cosway and his Wife—Nathaniel and Andrew Plimer and some Lady Miniaturists,	178
CHAPTER IX. The Nineteenth Century and the Decline of the Art,	200
CHAPTER X. Modern Miniature Painting—The Twentieth Century and its Opportunities,	218
CHAPTER XI. Foreign Portrait Miniaturists,	235
CHAPTER XII. Miniatures on Enamel,	269
APPENDIX—Collections and Collectors,	293
INDEX,	303

ERRATA

- Index, p. xiii.—*For* ‘about 1460’ *read* ‘about 1480.’
,, p. xvi, Plate VI.—*For* ‘William’ *read* ‘Philip.’
Plate XII.—*For* ‘signed 1668’ *read* ‘signed 1669.’
,, XVI.—*For* ‘William iv.’ *read* ‘William iii.’
,, XXX.—*For* ‘Humphrey’ *read* ‘Humphry.’
,, XL.—*For* ‘Montague’ *read* ‘Montagu.’
,, XLI.—*For* ‘Prewett’ *read* ‘Prewitt.’

LIST OF PLATES

PHILIP THE GOOD . *Frontispiece*

Plate	I.	.	.	<i>to face p.</i>	54
"	II.	.	.	"	64
"	III.	.	.	"	70
"	IV.	.	.	"	94
"	V.	.	.	"	104
"	VI.	.	.	"	106
"	VII.	.	.	"	110
"	VIII.	.	.	"	114
"	IX.	.	.	"	118
"	X.	.	.	"	120
"	XI.	.	.	"	124
"	XII.	.	.	"	128
"	XIII.	.	.	"	132
"	XIV.	.	.	"	136
"	XV.	.	.	"	138
"	XVI.	.	.	"	140
"	XVII.	.	.	"	144
"	XVIII.	.	.	"	148
"	XIX.	.	.	"	150
"	XX.	.	.	"	162

Plate	XXI.	.	<i>to face p.</i>	164
"	XXII.	.	"	172
"	XXIII.	.	"	180
"	XXIV.	.	"	184
"	XXV.	.	"	186
"	XXVI.	.	"	188
"	XXVII.	.	"	190
"	XXVIII.	.	"	192
"	XXIX.	.	"	194
"	XXX.	.	"	200
"	XXXI.	.	"	208
"	XXXII.	.	"	212
"	XXXIII.	.	"	216
"	XXXIV.	.	"	230
"	XXXV.	.	"	232
"	XXXVI.	.	"	244
"	XXXVII.	.	"	258
"	XXXVIII.	.	"	260
"	XXXIX.	.	"	274
"	XL.	.	"	280
"	XLI.	.	"	286
"	XLII.	.	"	288



INDEX TO PLATES

The Illustrations in this volume have in every instance been especially reproduced, with the owners' kind permission, from the original miniatures, and the copyrights are strictly reserved by the author, on behalf of the owners.

FRONTISPIECE

(COLOUR)

PHILIP THE GOOD, DUKE OF BURGUNDY.

Flemish miniature, date about 1460. From a Manuscript Book of the Order of the Fleece in Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge (MS. 187).

(Page 65.)



PLATE I

(COLLOTYPE)

PORTRAIT from the Genealogical Tree showing the alliances between the Royal Houses of Spain and Portugal. By SIMON BENNINGCK. BRITISH MUSEUM (Add. MS. 12,531).

(Page 69.)



CARDINAL MARINO GRIMANI.

By GIULIO CLOVIO. From the Manuscript 'In Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos commentarius' in Soane Museum.


(Page 55.)



MINIATURES

PLATE II

(COLLOTYPE)



MINIATURE OF CHRIST, with illuminated border.

Attributed to HANS MEMLING.

From a Book of Hours in Soane Museum.

Early Sixteenth Century.

(Page 64.)

PLATE III

(COLLOTYPE)



PORTRAITS from the Genealogical Tree showing the alliances between the Royal Houses of Spain and Portugal. By SIMON BENNING.

BRITISH MUSEUM (Add. MS. 12,531).

(Page 69.)

INDEX TO PLATES

PLATE IV

(PHOTOGRAVURE)

- No. 1. HENRY VIII., with illuminated borders in gold and red, and initials H. K.

Attributed to HANS HOLBEIN. From Strawberry Hill Collection.

Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.

- No. 2. HENRY VIII., wearing beard and elaborate dress.

By HANS HOLBEIN. Described in Vertue's Catalogue.

Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.

- No. 3. HANS HOLBEIN, holding pencil in right hand.

By HANS HOLBEIN. From Strawberry Hill Collection. Described by Wornum.

Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.

- No. 4. EDWARD VI. when a boy about five years old.

By HANS HOLBEIN. Probably belonged to Charles I.

Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.

(Page 94.)



PLATE V

(PHOTOGRAVURE)

- No. 1. QUEEN ELIZABETH, when young.

Attributed to NICHOLAS HILLIARD, but possibly by LEVINA TEERLINCK.

Owner: DUKE OF PORTLAND.

(Page 104.)



- No. 2. GEORGE CLIFFORD, 3rd EARL OF CUMBERLAND.

By NICHOLAS HILLIARD. Armour with gold inlaid. Exhibited at the Burlington Fine Arts Club, 1889.

Owner: MAJOR-GENERAL SOTHEY.

(Page 104.)



MINIATURES

PLATE VI

(COLLOTYPE)

No. 1. MARIE DE CLÉVES, PRINCESSE DE CONDÉ.

Catalogued as by J. CLOUET, but probably by FRANÇOIS CLOUET. With illuminated border in gold and black.

Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH. (*Page 238.*)

No. 2. SIR CHARLES LUCAS.

By JOHN HOSKINS (signed 1653). Exhibited Burlington Fine Arts Club, 1889. Illustrated in catalogue.

Owner: MAJOR-GENERAL SOTHEY.

No. 3. WILLIAM, EARL OF PEMBROKE.

By JOHN HOSKINS.

Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.

No. 4. THOMAS RATCLIFFE, 3rd EARL OF SUSSEX. (Unfinished.)

By NICHOLAS HILLIARD. Exhibited Burlington Fine Arts Club, 1889. Illustrated in catalogue.

Owner: MAJOR-GENERAL SOTHEY.

(*Page 104.*)

No. 5. ROBERT DEVEREUX, EARL OF ESSEX.

By JOHN BETTES.

Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH. (*Page 107.*)



PLATE VII

(PHOTOGRAVURE)

No. 1. QUEEN ELIZABETH.

By ISAAC OLIVER (signed). In dress of red, green, gold, and blue, lace veil and head-dress of pearls; pale complexion, dark eyes, and dark grey background.

Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH. (*Page 110.*)

No. 2. FRANCES HOWARD, COUNTESS OF ESSEX.

By ISAAC OLIVER (signed). With fair hair, heart of pearls, pale complexion, exquisite in detail. Exhibited at Burlington Fine Arts Club, 1889.

Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH. (*Page 111.*)

No. 3. ANNE OF DENMARK, Queen of James VI. of Scotland.

By ISAAC OLIVER (signed). With fair hair, pale complexion, beautiful in detail. Exhibited at Burlington Fine Arts Club, 1889, and illustrated in catalogue.

Owner: MAJOR-GENERAL SOTHEY.

(*Page 110.*)

No. 4. LADY HAY, daughter of Earl of Carlisle.

By ISAAC OLIVER. With high black hat, black and gold bodice, pink and white complexion.

Owner: MAJOR-GENERAL SOTHEY.

(*Page 111.*)



INDEX TO PLATES

PLATE VIII

(COLLOTYPE)

- No. 1. LADY ARABELLA STUART.
By PETER OLIVER (signed). With gold
embroidered dress, cut low.
Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.
(Page 113.)

- No. 2. PETER OLIVER.
By himself. Tinted drawing. With auburn
hair and full complexion.
Owner: DUKE OF PORTLAND.
(Page 141.)

- No. 3. CHARLES II.
By PETER OLIVER.
Owner: SIR TOLLEMACHE SINCLAIR.
(Page 114.)

- No. 4. CHARLES LOUIS, COUNT PALATINE.
By PETER OLIVER. Excellent modelling.
Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.
(Page 113.)

- No. 5. SIR KENELM DIGBY.
By PETER OLIVER (signed 1619). With
dark background. Fine drawing and
modelling.
Owner: MAJOR-GENERAL SOTHEY.
(Page 114.)



PLATE IX

(COLLOTYPE)

- No. 1. JOHN HOSKINS.
By himself (signed).
Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.
(Page 145.)

- No. 2. ALGERNON SIDNEY.
By JOHN HOSKINS (signed I. H., 1639).
With black doublet slashed with white.
Dark hair. Very fine miniature.
Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.
(Page 119.)

- No. 3. MARY, PRINCESS OF ORANGE.
By JOHN HOSKINS (signed I. H., 1644).
With dark hair, dark, pale complexion,
blue dress. Sad brown background.
Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.
(Page 120.)



MINIATURES

PLATE X

(COLOUR)



No. 1. JAMES, DUKE OF YORK (JAMES II.).

By SAMUEL COOPER. With grey and yellow doublet, blue sash, cloudy background, long brown hair. Exhibited at Burlington Fine Arts Club, 1889. Illustrated in catalogue.

Owner : MAJOR-GENERAL SOTHEY.

(Page 128.)



No. 2. SIR EDMUNDBURY GODFREY (murdered, 1698).

By JOHN HOSKINS (signed 1663). With beautifully painted collar, black slashed doublet. Fine colour and drawing. Exhibited at Burlington Fine Arts Club, 1889.

Owner : MAJOR-GENERAL SOTHEY.

(Page 120.)

PLATE XI

(PHOTOGRAVURE)



No. 1. OLIVER CROMWELL (unfinished).

By SAMUEL COOPER.

Owner : DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.

No. 2. MRS. CLAYPOLE (daughter of Cromwell).

By SAMUEL COOPER.

Owner : DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.



No. 3. OLIVER CROMWELL'S WIFE.

By SAMUEL COOPER.

These three miniatures contained in one case with a pair of sleeve-links and coins of the Protectorate.

Owner : DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.

(Page 124.)

INDEX TO PLATES

PLATE XII

(PHOTOGRAVURE)

No. 1. COLONEL SIDNEY, afterwards LORD RUMNEY.

By SAMUEL COOPER (signed 1669). With soft fair hair, a red ribbon over white collar. Painted with opaque colours.

Owner : DUKE OF PORTLAND.

(Page 132.)

No. 2. JOHN, EARL OF CLARE.

By SAMUEL COOPER (signed 1656). Wearing black skull-cap ; dark brown hair ; fine flesh-colour and drawing.

Owner : DUKE OF PORTLAND.

(Page 132.)

No. 3. FRANCES, DUCHESS OF RICHMOND. 'La Belle Stuart.'

By SAMUEL COOPER (signed 1655). Wearing yellow bodice, with a red curtain and blue sky in background. Complexion fair and delicate.

Owner : DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.

(Page 129.)



PLATE XIII

(COLOUR)

No. 1. DUCHESS OF PORTSMOUTH.

By NATHANIEL DIXON (signed). With dark black hair, yellow drapery, and grey background.

Owner : MAJOR-GENERAL SOTHEBY.

(Page 137.)

No. 2. LADY CRISPE, wife of Sir Nicholas Crispe.

By NATHANIEL DIXON (signed). Strong, masculine face, brown in the flesh-colour ; finely drawn. Exhibited at Burlington Fine Arts Club, 1889.

Owner : MAJOR-GENERAL SOTHEBY.

(Page 137.)

No. 3. LUCY PERCY, COUNTESS OF CARLISLE.

By SAMUEL COOPER. Dark hair, black bodice, blue shawl, opaque in flesh painting.

Owner : MAJOR-GENERAL SOTHEBY.

(Page 130.)

No. 4. ELECTOR PALATINE.

By PETER OLIVER (signed 1621). Fine drawing and good flesh-colour.

Owner : MAJOR-GENERAL SOTHEBY.

(Page 114.)



MINIATURES

PLATE XIV

(COLLOTYPE)

No. 1. ELIZABETH, COUNTESS OF NORTHUMBERLAND.

Unknown. In style of N. Dixon. Delicate in colour; pearly in quality; very fair hair.

Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.

(Page 137.)



No. 2. PORTRAIT OF A LADY. Unknown.

By NATHANIEL DIXON. Wearing beautiful blue green dress with pearl trimming. Very fair hair and delicate complexion.

Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.

(Page 137.)



No. 3. SIR HENRY VANE.

By THOMAS FLATMAN (signed T. F., 1661). Possessing many of the qualities of Cooper's work. Sober in colour and tone.

Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.

(Page 134.)

No. 4. MR. SYMSON, Master of Music.

By THOMAS FLATMAN (signed F.). Strong in drawing and sober in colour. Of the Cooper school.

Owner: DUKE OF PORTLAND.

(Page 135.)

PLATE XV

(PHOTOGRAVURE)

No. 1. ANDREW MARVELL, Poet and Satirist.

By FRANCIS CLEYN. Miniature in oil on copper. Very highly finished, with excellent drawing. Exhibited at Burlington Fine Arts Club, 1889, and illustrated in catalogue.

Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.

(Page 138.)



No. 2. SIR NICHOLAS CRISPE.

By CORNELIUS JANSEN. Miniature in oil on copper. Exhibited at Burlington Fine Arts Club, 1889.

Owner: MAJOR-GEN. SOTHEY.

(Page 115.)

No. 3. PORTRAIT OF A GENTLEMAN.

By CORNELIUS JANSEN. Miniature in oil on copper.

Owner: DUKE OF PORTLAND.

(Page 115.)

No. 4. JAMES, DUKE OF MONMOUTH.

By RICHARD GIBSON, called the dwarf. Dirty in colour.

Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.

(Page 139.)

INDEX TO PLATES

PLATE XVI

(PHOTOGRAVURE)

No. 1. WILLIAM III.

By THOMAS FORSTER (signed). Miniature in plumbago, or pencil.
Very fine drawing.

Owner: DUKE OF PORTLAND.

(Page 140.)



No. 2. THE INFANT KING OF ROME, son of Napoleon Bonaparte.

By ISABEY. Miniature in plumbago, or pencil.

Owner: DUKE OF PORTLAND.

(Page 140.)



PLATE XVII

(PHOTOGRAVURE)

No. 1. JOHN HOLLES, DUKE OF NEWCASTLE.

By LAURENCE CROSSE (signed L.C.). One of the finest examples
by this artist.

Owner: DUKE OF PORTLAND.

(Page 145.)



No. 2. SARAH, DUCHESS OF MARLBOROUGH.

By LAURENCE CROSSE (signed). With fair hair and bright blue
bodice.

Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.

(Page 145.)



MINIATURES

PLATE XVIII

(COLLOTYPE)



No. 1. PORTRAIT OF A LADY.

By BERNARD LENS (signed). With dark hair, grey-blue bodice, and dark blue shawl.

Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.

(Page 147.)



No. 2. MATTHEW PRIOR, Poet.

By BERNARD LENS. Wearing turban, rich brown vest, and reddish gown lined with blue.

Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.

(Page 147.)

PLATE XIX

(COLLOTYPE)



No. 1. JAMES II.

By JACQUES ANTOINE ARLAUD. In steel gilt armour, long greyish wig, red ruffle, and white stock.

Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.

(Page 150.)



No. 2. JAMES, DUKE OF ORMOND.

By CHRISTIAN RICHTER. Wearing grey wig, armour, and red drapery.

Owner: DUKE OF PORTLAND.

(Page 149.)

INDEX TO PLATES

PLATE XX

(COLLOTYPE)

No. 1. PRINCESS AMELIA.

By RICHARD COLLINS. (After the picture by
Sir Thomas Lawrence.)

Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.

(Page 161.)

No. 2. PORTRAIT OF A BOY.

By NATHANIEL HONE.

No. 3. PORTRAIT OF A GIRL.

By A. DANIELS.

No. 4. PRINCESS LIEVEN.

By UPTON.

Owner: SIR TOLLEMACHE SINCLAIR.




PLATE XXI

(PHOTOGRAVURE)

No. 1. LADY EGLINTON.

By WILLIAM WOOD (signed).

Owner: SIR TOLLEMACHE SINCLAIR.

(Page 170.)

No. 2. PORTRAIT OF A LADY.

By JOHN SMART.

From the WALLACE COLLECTION, HERTFORD HOUSE.

(Page 163.)



MINIATURES

PLATE XXII

(COLLOTYPE)



No. 1. PORTRAIT OF A LADY.

By GEORGE ENGLEHEART.

From the WALLACE COLLECTION,
HERTFORD HOUSE.

(Page 172.)



No. 2. DUCHESS OF PORTLAND.

By ANDREW PLIMER.

Owner: DUKE OF PORTLAND.

No. 3. MRS. UDNEY, friend of Richard Cosway.

By MRS. MEE (ANNE FLODSONE.)

From HOLBURN MUSEUM, BATH.

(Page 198.)

PLATE XXIII

(PHOTOGRAVURE)



'Youth losing her charms as Old Age advances.'

From a pencil-drawing by RICHARD COSWAY (signed).

Owner: SIR TOLLEMACHE SINCLAIR.

(Page 188.)

INDEX TO PLATES

PLATE XXIV

(COLOUR)

No. 1. MRS. BUTLER (FANNY KEMBLE).

By RICHARD COSWAY.

Owner: MR. HENRY DRAKE.

(Page 189.)



No. 2. ELIZABETH FOSTER, DUCHESS OF DEVONSHIRE.

By RICHARD COSWAY.

Owner: MR. HENRY DRAKE.

(Page 189.)



PLATE XXV

(COLLOTYPE)

MRS. FITZHERBERT.

By RICHARD COSWAY. Set in a green leather pocket-case belonging to Cosway, with his address in Stratford Place stamped on it.

Owner: SIR TOLLEMACHE SINCLAIR.

(Page 188.)



XXV

MINIATURES

PLATE XXVI

(COLOUR)



No. 1. LADY HARCOURT, wife of third Earl.
By RICHARD COSWAY.
Owner: MR. HENRY DRAKE.



No. 2. PORTRAIT OF A GENTLEMAN.
By ANDREW PLIMER.
Owner: MR. HENRY DRAKE.



No. 3. LADY MANNERS, afterwards LADY HUNTINGDON.
By RICHARD COSWAY.
Owner: MR. HENRY DRAKE.

(Page 189.)



No. 4. PORTRAIT OF A GIRL.
By SAMUEL SHELLEY.
Owner: SIR TOLLEMACHE SINCLAIR.

(Page 169.)

PLATE XXVII

(PHOTOGRAVURE)



No. 1. MRS. ROBINSON ('Perdita').
Unknown.

(Page 190.)



No. 2. GEORGE, PRINCE REGENT.
By RICHARD COSWAY. Unfinished.

(Page 189.)



No. 3. PRINCESS CHARLOTTE OF WALES.
By FRANÇOIS ROCHARD. Wrongly ascribed to A. Chalon on Plate.

From the HOLBURN MUSEUM, BATH.
(Page 253.)

INDEX TO PLATES

PLATE XXVIII

(COLLOTYPE)

- No. 1. PORTRAIT OF A LADY.
By MARIA COSWAY.
From the HOLBURN MUSEUM, BATH.

- No. 2. PORTRAIT OF A LADY.
By MARIA COSWAY.
From the HOLBURN MUSEUM, BATH.

- No. 3. MISS OGLE.
By RICHARD COSWAY.
Owner: MR. HENRY DRAKE.

- No. 4. PORTRAIT OF A LADY.
By MARIA COSWAY.
From the HOLBURN MUSEUM, BATH.
(Page 192.)



PLATE XXIX.

(COLOUR)

- No. 1. PORTRAIT OF A GENTLEMAN.
By RICHARD COSWAY.
Owner: SIR TOLLEMACHE
SINCLAIR.

- No. 2. CHARLES HEATH (Engraver).
By ANDREW ROBERTSON.
Owner: MR. LIONEL HEATH.
(Page 204.)

- No. 3. SIR JOHN SINCLAIR.
By ANDREW PLIMER.
Owner: SIR TOLLEMACHE
SINCLAIR.
(Page 193.)



MINIATURES

PLATE XXX

(PHOTOGRAVURE)



No. 1. THE PRINCESS AMELIA.

By ANDREW ROBERTSON. Wearing blue hat and bodice, and strong in flesh-colour.

Owner: H.M. KING EDWARD VII.

(Page 203.)



No. 2. THE PRINCESS ROYAL, when a child.

By OZIAS HUMPHRY.

Owner: H.M. KING EDWARD VII.

(Page 166.)

PLATE XXXI

(PHOTOGRAVURE)



No. 1. MRS. DALTON.

By SIR WILLIAM ROSS.

From VICTORIA AND ALBERT MUSEUM, SOUTH KENSINGTON.

(Page 207.)

No. 2. PORTRAIT OF A LADY.

By SIR WILLIAM J. NEWTON.

From VICTORIA AND ALBERT MUSEUM.

(Page 208.)

No. 3. PORTRAIT OF A LADY.

By JOHN BOGLE.

From VICTORIA AND ALBERT MUSEUM.

(Page 175.)



No. 4. T. T. NEEDHAM, F.R.S.

By HENRY EDRIDGE. After Sir Joshua Reynolds.

From HOLBURNE MUSEUM, BATH.

(Page 173.)

INDEX TO PLATES

PLATE XXXII

(PHOTOGRAVURE)

JOHN KEATS.

By JOSEPH SEVERN.

Owner : SIR CHARLES DILKE.

(Page 212.)



PLATE XXXIII

(PHOTOGRAVURE)

No. 1. 'WINIFRED.'

By H. CHARLES HEATH.

Owner : MR. LIONEL HEATH.

(Page 215.)



No. 2. THE DUCHESS OF PORTLAND.

By CHARLES TURRELL.

Owner : THE ARTIST.

(Page 216.)



MINIATURES

PLATE XXXIV

(COLOUR)



No. 1. A PORTRAIT OF A LADY.

By LIONEL HEATH.

Owner: THE ARTIST.

(Page 230.)



No. 2. A PORTRAIT OF A CHILD.

By HELENA HORWITZ.

Owner: THE ARTIST.

(Page 230.)

PLATE XXXV

(COLOUR)



No. 1. HEAD OF A GIRL.

By ALYN WILLIAMS.

Owner: THE ARTIST.

(Page 230.)



No. 2. PORTRAIT OF A GENTLEMAN.

By ALICE MOTT.

Owner: THE ARTIST.

(Page 230.)

INDEX TO PLATES

PLATE XXXVI

(PHOTOGRAVURE)

No. 1. PORTRAIT OF A LADY.

By PIERRE ADOLPHE HALL. Painted in *gouache*.

From the WALLACE COLLECTION, HERTFORD HOUSE.

(Page 246.)



No. 2. THE COUNTESS DU BARRI.

By JACQUES CHARLIER. Painted in *gouache*.

Owner: SIR TOLLEMACHE SINCLAIR.

(Page 245.)



PLATE XXXVII

(COLLOTYPE)

No. 1. ROSALEA CARRIERA.

By herself. Painted in *gouache*.

Owner: DUKE OF PORTLAND.

(Page 244.)



No. 2. PORTRAIT OF A LADY.

By HEINSOR.

Owner: SIR TOLLEMACHE SINCLAIR.



No. 3. A PROFILE HEAD.

By HEINRICH FRIEDRICH FÜGER. Set in the lid of a *bonbonnière*.

Owner: MR. HENRY DRAKE.

(Page 257.)

MINIATURES

PLATE XXXVIII

(COLOUR)



PORTRAIT OF A LADY.


By MANSION. After the original in the Wallace Collection.

Owner : SIR TOLLEMACHE SINCLAIR.

(Page 253.)

PLATE XXXIX

(COLLOTYPE)



No. 1. COUNTESS DE GRIGNAN, daughter of Madame de Sévigné.

Enamel by JEAN PETITOT.

No. 2. GIULIO, CARDINAL MAZARIN.

Enamel by JEAN PETITOT.



No. 3. HENRIETTE, DUCHESSE D'ORLEANS, daughter of Charles I.

Enamel by JEAN PETITOT.

No. 4. LA MARQUISE DE SÉVIGNÉ.

Enamel by JEAN PETITOT.



No. 5. ANNE (NINON) DE L'ENCLOS, beauty of time of Louis XV.

Enamel by JEAN PETITOT.

From the JONES COLLECTION, SOUTH KENSINGTON.



Page 276.

INDEX TO PLATES

PLATE XL

(COLOUR)

- No. 1. LADY MARY WORTLEY MONTAGU.
Enamel by JEAN ÉTIENNE LIOTARD (?).

(Page 281.)



- No. 2. ANNE (NINON) DE L'ENCLOS.

Miniature—unknown.

Owner: SIR TOLLEMACHE SINCLAIR.

(Page 276.)



PLATE XLI

(PHOTOGRAVURE)

- No. 1. THE COUNTESS OF COVENTRY.

By GERVASE SPENCER. (Page 286.)

- No. 2. ADMIRAL JOHN BYNG.

By GERVASE SPENCER.

Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.

(Page 286.)

- No. 3. FRANÇOIS BOUCHER (Painter).

By BERNET.

Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.

- No. 4. DUCHESSE DE LA VALLIÈRE.

By J. PETITOT.

Owner: SIR TOLLEMACHE SINCLAIR.

(Page 276.)

- No. 5. M^{LE}. FANTANGES.

By J. PETITOT.

Owner: SIR TOLLEMACHE SINCLAIR.

(Page 276.)

- No. 6. HANDEL (in a ring).

By F. ZINCKE.

Owner: SIR TOLLEMACHE SINCLAIR.

- No. 7. A LADY.

By F. ZINCKE.

Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.


(Page 283.)

- No. 8. HORACE WALPOLE.

By W. PREWITT.

Owner: DUKE OF BUCCLEUCH.

(Page 287.)



MINIATURES

PLATE XLII

(COLOUR)



THE COUNTESS OF DYSART.

Enamel by HENRY BONE, after Sir Joshua Reynolds. Exhibited at the Burlington Fine Arts Club, 1889.

Owner: SIR TOLLEMACHE SINCLAIR.

(Page 290.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A LIST OF THE PRINCIPAL WORKS ON MINIATURES, AND BOOKS CONTAINING IMPORTANT REFERENCES TO THE ART.

BOUCHOT (HENRI): *Les Clouet et Corneille de Lyon*. Paris, 1892.

Containing good reproductions from miniatures, drawings, and other works attributed to these artists.

BOUDERY (LOUIS): *Les Émaux Peints*. Limoges, 1888.

Being a complete history of the art of enamelling from the fifteenth century to modern times.

BRADLEY (JOHN W.), B.A. (London): *A Dictionary of Miniaturists, Illuminators, Calligraphers, and Copyists*.

A book of reference, containing notices of patrons, and principally dealing with the Manuscript Miniaturists from the establishment of Christianity to the eighteenth century.

The Life and Works of J. S. Clovio. London, 1891.

Containing a complete account of Clovio's work and useful references to his contemporaries, with several good portraits of Clovio, and ten illustrations in collotype from manuscript miniatures by the artist. At the commencement of the volume is a useful chronology of events during his life.

BRYAN (MICHAEL): *Dictionary of Artists*. London, 1898.

MINIATURES

BURLINGTON FINE ARTS CLUB PUBLICATIONS:—

Catalogue to the Exhibition of Portrait Miniatures,
1889.

Containing a short historical account of the art.

CARRIERA (ROSALBA): *Journal de Rosalba Carriera pendant son séjour à Paris en 1720 et 1721, publié en Italien par Vianelli*. Paris, 1865.

CLAYTON (E. C.): *English Female Artists*. Beccles, 1876.

Containing an amusing and pithy account of the life of Maria Cosway, with references to Richard Cosway, and biographical notices of Mary Moser and Angelica Kauffmann, etc.

CUNNINGHAM (ALLAN): *The Lives of the most Eminent British Painters*, 1846.

In which is an interesting account of the life and work of Richard Cosway.

DIMIER (L.): *French Painting in the Sixteenth Century*. Illustrated. Translated from the French by Harold Child. London, 1904.

DOUGLAS (ROBERT LANGTON): *History of Siena*, 1902.

Containing references to the Sienese School of Miniaturists.

Fra Angelico, 1901.

FOSTER (J. F.): *British Miniature Painters*. London, 1898.

With useful appendices of reference to the sale of Walpole's famous collection at Strawberry Hill, and the loan exhibitions of miniatures at South Kensington in 1865, the Winter Exhibition of 1879, Messrs. Dickinson's collection in 1880, and the New Gallery in 1889, 1890, and 1891. With 133 excellent illustrations in photogravure and half-tone. Limited edition.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GARNIER (EDOUARD): *Histoire de la Verrerie et de l'Émaillerie*.

The second part comprises an interesting history of enamelling in its various branches, from its origin in antiquity to recent times. Fully illustrated with woodcuts, and a few very excellent full-page coloured lithographs.

HUMBERT (PROF. E.), REVILLIOD (M. ALPHONSE), and TILANUS (PROF. J. W. R.): *La Vie et les Œuvres de J. É. Liotard*. Amsterdam, 1897.

A treatise on the life and methods of the Swiss painter and miniaturist, with 61 illustrations, excellently reproduced, of his best work in various mediums.

JAFFÉ (ALBERT): *Miniatur-Katalog*. Hamburg.

A recent illustrated catalogue, comprising nearly 600 names of miniaturists of all nationalities, illustrated with a large number of plates containing many groups of small reproductions from miniatures, only of slight value as reference, and a few remarks on the art by the author.

LABITTE (ALPHONSE): *Les Manuscrits et l'Art de les orner*. Paris, 1893.

Comprising a complete review of the historical and practical aspect of the art of illumination from the earliest times to the present day. Illustrated with 300 reproductions in line and tone of miniatures, borders, and illuminated letters.

LABORDE (MARQUIS DE): *Notice des Émaux exposés dans les Galeries du Musée du Louvre*. Paris, 1852-53.

Part I. being a catalogue devoted to the enamels in the Louvre, which are described in detail, with historical notes of great interest.

MINIATURES

LABORDE (MARQUIS DE): *La Renaissance des Arts à la Cour de France; études sur le Seizième Siècle. Peinture.* Paris, 1850-55.

An account of all the famous French painters of the sixteenth century, and their various methods of work, including that of Jean Fouquet and other miniaturists. An excellent book of reference.

LACROIX (PAUL): *The Arts in the Middle Ages and at the Period of the Renaissance.* Translated by J. Dafforne. London, 1870.

Illustrated with 19 chromolithographic prints and upwards of 400 engravings on wood.

LISINI (ALESSANDRO): *Le Tavolette dipinte di Siena.* 1901.

Containing many full-page reproductions from the miniatures of the Sienese School, with an account of each.

MEYER (ALFRED): *L'Art de l'Émail de Limoges, ancien et modern.* Paris, 1897.

Being a technical description of the art of enamelling, with illustrations in tone.

MILANESI (GAETANO): *Le Vite de' più eccellente Pittori, Scultori ed Architettori.* By Giorgio Vasari. 1878.

MOLINIER (AUGUSTE): *Les Manuscrits et les Miniatures.* Paris, 1892.

Being a careful treatise on the art of illumination, especially in France, from antiquity to the nineteenth century. Illustrated with 80 wood engravings.

MOLINIER (EMILE): *Dictionnaire des Émailleurs.* Paris, 1885.

A dictionary of enamellists from the Middle Ages to the close of the eighteenth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

NAGLER: *Künstler-Lexikon*. Leipzig, 1872.

A general art dictionary, written with the co-operation of the most famous specialists.

PATTISON (MRS. MARK) (LADY DILKE): *The Renaissance of Art in France*. London, 1879.

Containing general description and criticism of the work of Fouquet, the Clouets, etc.

PROPERT (J. L.): *History of Miniature Art*. London, 1887.

A standard history of the art for the collector, containing several chapters on the early manuscript miniatures, and articles on various allied subjects, such as *La Petite Sculpture*, modelling in wax, snuff-boxes, etc. Limited edition. It is illustrated with many plates from manuscripts and miniature portraits, in collotype, etc., in most cases from the Propert collection; but Samuel Cooper, Hoskins, Laurence Crosse, and Ozias Humphry are hardly adequately represented.

REDGRAVE (RICHARD): *Century of Painters*. London, 1890.

ROBERTSON (EMILY): *Andrew Robertson, Miniature Painter*. London, 1897.

A series of letters and papers in reference to his life and work, and a treatise on the art by his elder brother, Archibald Robertson. The second edition contains some excellent reproductions, 12 in number, of Robertson's larger miniatures on ivory. A very useful book for the student.

ROUQUET (M.): *L'État des Arts en Angleterre*. Paris, 1755.

SMITH (JOHN THOMAS): *Nollekens and his Times*. London, 1828.

Containing an account of Cosway's life and work.

MINIATURES

TAIGRY (EDMOND): *Jean Baptiste Isabey: sa vie et ses œuvres*. Paris, 1859.

VILLOT (FRÉDÉRIC): *Biographie de Pierre Adolphe Hall* (miniature painter). Paris, 1867.

Being a comprehensive account of his life and work, with interesting references to French contemporaries.

WALPOLE (HORACE): *Anecdotes of Painting*. London, 1888.

With many references to the miniaturists of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, and biographical and critical commentaries. Illustrated with portraits of the artists.

WEALE (W. H. JAMES): *Notes on the Miniature Painters and Illuminators of Bruges, 1457-1523*. 1883.

WILLIAMSON (G. C.): *Portrait Miniatures*. London, 1897.

Richard Cosway. London, 1897.

WILLIAMSON (G. C.) and ENGLEHEART (H. L. D.): *George Engleheart*. London, 1902.

WORNUM'S *Life of Holbein*. London, 1867.

A complete biography, with useful appendices, and an engraved portrait from the original drawing by Holbein in the Museum at Basle, showing the artist when a young man.

MINIATURES

CHAPTER I

THE ORIGIN OF THE MINIATURE—ITS GROWTH IN THE
ILLUMINATED MANUSCRIPTS OF THE ELEVENTH
TO THE FIFTEENTH CENTURIES.

ART crystallises for us the romance in human life and thought. Without art the history of man's progress would be almost unintelligible, if not entirely a blank, in its earliest epochs. In the eloquence of a line, in the emotion of colour, or the rhythm of a pattern, we have, as it were, the story of man's existence autographically written for us by his own hand and brain. The power of man's artistic expression is in relation to his loftiness of soul, strength of character and health of mind and body; and by the manner of his expression we may gauge his degree of culture, or approximate the date at which he lived in the obscurities of the past.

The pages of our human history are made beautiful and fascinating by this constant endeavour to give expression to our nobler selves, and convey to others our dreams and visions of things real and imaginary. In this picture-book of man's development, we have a gospel of belief in a greater perfection, and a testimony to our best and bravest hopes.

If art engrosses our interests because of its romantic reflection of what is noblest in man, then of its many phases, the art of miniature painting appeals to us especially, because it is the most personal, and conveys to our minds more completely than any other the realities of the past. In it we see reflected the fashions and

MINIATURES

vanities, the graces and quaintnesses of our ancestors, and in the miniatures of mediæval manuscripts we have mirrored for us the religious and social life of each period, which adds an historical value we can hardly over-estimate.

The companionable proportions of the miniature portrait make peculiar appeal to our affections. Unlike the life-size portrait, it is truly described as being always in scale, superficially and artistically, with its surroundings, and whilst it does not so grossly challenge our comparison, it may still be an invaluable historical and biographical record.

To the English people, the art of portrait miniature is a national asset of exceptional worth, and it is rightly considered in some ways exclusively an English art. It was originally introduced into this country by a great German artist, but its greatest exponents since have undoubtedly been Englishmen, who, though painters 'in little,' will bear comparison with the greatest portrait painters of their time.

It is the national importance which the miniature holds in the history of our art which makes it essential for us to gain a true appreciation of it. To do this adequately we must retrace the records of the art back to its starting-point, and discover how its earlier traditions affected and caused its later developments.

Previous writers on this subject have said it is difficult to show any direct connection between the miniaturists of the illuminated manuscripts and the painters of miniature portraits; it is, however, certain that there exist many examples of portraits painted into the illuminated manuscripts, especially those of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries. There is also evidence to show that there existed a very close connection indeed between the Renaissance painters and the illuminators and miniaturists of that period. But further evidence is to be found, I think, in the beautiful decorative sense with which the early portrait miniaturists arranged their sub-

PRE-HISTORIC DRAWING

ject in the square, round, or oval shape, and also the similitude of their methods and technique, recalling the finest and best traditions of the illuminated manuscripts.

If we wish for a reason to explain the final independence of the later art, we have it principally in the invention of printing and the consequent collapse of 'illumination.'

It would be easy to assume that the earliest scratchings on bones by primeval man were the first germs of illuminating and graphic art, and therefore, through a prolonged process of evolution, directly responsible for the ivory miniature. Without being in the least extravagant in our assumptions, there is indeed something that we may learn suggestively and technically from these earliest representations of animals, scratched upon horns, tusks, and bones.

They were of course done, not as an idle amusement, but in place of language, to convey ideas, and technically they show an accurate power of observation of the proportions and general characteristics of the animals portrayed which compares most favourably with the art of much later periods—periods when expression by language, which is but the perfecting of the symbols for things, had in great measure reduced the necessity of observation, and when we find that human and animal forms were represented in a stiff, conventional, and mechanical manner.

This suggests the conclusion that drawing should be taught to the child as a most natural mode of expression, and as a means of education, and that instead of being considered merely an accomplishment, it should be looked upon as an important branch of elementary education.

Interesting as it would be to trace through this primitive source so vast a subject as the growth of ideas and their mediums of expression, it must suffice, within the limited scope of the present volume, to consider the art of 'painting in little,' as Pepys called miniature painting, as having its origin in the decorated manuscript.

MINIATURES

In tracing the art of miniature painting back to its original source, we can have no better indication of its ancient and primitive origin than the etymology of the word itself. The derivation of the word 'miniature' reveals to us a much more remote birth than its present-day use would imply; in fact, it takes us back to the earliest beginnings of art itself in the first efforts to decorate ancient manuscripts.

'Minium,' the Latin name for a preparation of 'red-lead,' was the pigment which the earliest scribes used to give colour to the initial letters and headings of their MSS. Then the term 'miniatura' came gradually to mean the picture painted by the artists as part of the illuminated book. So we see that from this one touch of colour, this spontaneous effort to give life and decoration to the text, has grown and evolved an art which has passed through the vicissitudes of centuries, and reflects their development in manners, customs, artistic inspiration and technical skill.

From the time of its infancy in the earliest MSS., and its growth and development in the illuminated page, when it decoratively symbolised the religious thought of the time, to its maturity and independence as an art which took portraiture as its principal motive, we can trace its most intimate connection with human thought and human emotion.

We find that from the first the motive of the scribe in the arrangement of his text on the page was essentially a decorative one. He was a calligrapher and a craftsman who looked upon the page as a space to be made beautiful by his handiwork. In the earlier manuscripts he generally arranged the mass in a single column with broad margins, and relieved by large and small initial letters; these being a useful and beautiful focus of interest in the monotonous field of text. Gradually, as his skill and his ambitions grew, he became an illuminator—the initial letters ramified out into branches and buds, spreading themselves luxuriantly up and down

THE PARENT-LAND OF ILLUMINATION

the margin of the vellum page in a well-ordered rhythm of design and colour, sometimes occupying the whole length of a page. As a most natural sequence in the evolution of artistic inspiration, he then used the initial letter itself as a shrine in which to set a delicate, jewel-like representation of a saint or martyr, the entire illumination being kept strictly in harmony with the general scheme of the ornamentation of the page.

The threads in the story of this development are necessarily thin and disconnected in the earlier passages. The ravages of time have left us few examples of very early illuminated manuscripts, and these possibly not always the best. That these few examples exist is without doubt due to their small dimensions, and to their being an integral part of manuscripts which possess greater value in other directions. Mural decorations, paintings on canvas and panel, suffered injuries from many causes from which manuscripts were preserved. Miniature painting in a great measure reflects the general state of the art of the period, though it may be considered to be, as a rule, somewhat behind it. Enough remains for us to be able to gather up one by one the loops in the mutilated fabric of its history, and weave anew the story of the art. To pick up the first thread of our romance we must put on the purple mantle of the East and turn to Egypt, that mysterious parent land of all the arts, to discover the process of decorating manuscripts with gold, silver, and colour. These early writings were on papyrus, and generally contained capitals, headings, and sometimes even a small miniature of a mythological subject, drawn in colour. From the East the art was brought into our hemisphere by skilful Greek artists, who had visited the court of Persia, or had had intercourse with the craftsmen of other centres of ancient learning.

The beautiful purple stained vellum is also of very ancient origin. The Romans employed it as early as the third century A.D. as wrappers for their papyrus rolls. The *Codex Purpureo-Argenteus*, described by authorities as

MINIATURES

the work of Ulfilas and written about 350 A.D., is a fine example of purple vellum and silver lettering, preserved at Upsala, in Sweden, but it can hardly be called an illuminated manuscript. The earliest classical miniatures, originating in the decadence of Græco-Roman art, are authoritatively assigned to the fourth century, or even earlier. They are Latin manuscripts, and are known as the three Vatican Virgils. The first one, the Codex Romanus, contains about thirty large illustrations, described by Dr. Propert as rough in execution; the second contains no illustrations; and the third Virgil, known as the Schedae Vaticanae, is a later work, in which the miniatures differ altogether from the confused illustrations of the earlier Codex, and appear as single portraits of very great merit. Fifty-eight fragments of the Iliad, now kept in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, belong probably to the fifth century, and the Greek Genesis of Vienna belongs to the same period, and is full of Biblical illustrations. There once belonged to the Cottonian Library an older Genesis, which was unfortunately nearly consumed in the fire which destroyed so many precious manuscripts. What remains of it is now in the British Museum, and it was evidently full of miniatures of very considerable excellence. The figures are classic in pose and drawing, but in the accessories we can see indications of the commencement of Byzantine art. It is not until after the dawn of the Christian era that we can trace the existence of a school or style of pure ornament in the manuscript.

Under the protection of Constantine the Great, the first Christian Emperor of the Roman Empire, Christian art may be said to have left the hermitage of the catacombs and to have shown its face boldly to the world. It was about A.D. 350 that Constantine, having victoriously reunited the Roman Empire, removed his capital from Rome to Byzantium, afterwards rechristened Constantinople. To make it in all respects worthy of the Empire, he called to his aid skilled Greek artists,

BYZANTINE ART

many of whom had travelled in the East and brought back with them men well trained in various arts and crafts. Here it was that the new Byzantine style, which was destined to have so wide an influence, had its birth.

The spirit of Christianity operating on the artistic Greek nature gave a new motive to ancient art, which, as distinguished by its special characteristics, may almost be said to have ceased about the beginning of the fourth century of the Christian era. The early Christians had a decided aversion to all works of imitative art, as essentially conducive to idolatry, an aversion which resolved itself into a kind of superstitious dread of approximating to the forms and appearance of the pagan idols. Their art is little more than a symbolical inculcation of certain religious principles. Gradually as the stability of Christianity increased, greater toleration in respect to images existed, until in the fifth century it became much more usual to decorate churches, erected in honour of the saints, with illustrations of their martyrdom, in colours and mosaics.

Up to the time of Justinian, in the sixth century, the style of art in Constantinople was similar in conception, form, and colour to that which is preserved to us in the paintings at Pompeii. The Byzantines lacked the impulse or inspiration to create anything new. If they studied the noble treasures of art which they had inherited, and endeavoured to preserve the classic forms of the antique, they entirely ceased to study nature; and, the spirit of the past having departed, their art could only degenerate into an ignoble and lifeless imitation. In spite of this we must recognise the powerful influence which Byzantine art had on the schools of the West, and it therefore assumes the greatest importance in the history of art. Its influence can be seen in the miniatures of all nations and periods, down to the thirteenth century; it can be traced in our own Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, and, as some writers think, in the Celtic also.

The figure drawing of the Byzantine miniatures is

MINIATURES

elongated in proportion, especially in the extremities, which have no foreshortening, and the types are stiff and conventional. The motives of the drapery are mostly paltry, appearing in either narrow, parallel, stiffly drawn folds, or so overladen with barbaric ornaments and jewels as to exclude all indication of form. The flesh is usually a dark brown tone, and the other colours are heavy, gaudy, and hard, whilst in the backgrounds and glories gold was made much use of.

The Book of Joshua, in the Vatican, which is a volume or roll of parchment, thirty-two feet long, probably dating from the seventh century, is one of the few Byzantine manuscripts existing, older than the eleventh century, and it is said to be full of excellent miniatures.

As it is necessary for me to condense the history of an art through many centuries into a single chapter, I shall content myself with giving a detailed account of a Psalter in the Egerton Collection (No. 1139). An authority has rightly said that for those who have not the opportunity of becoming acquainted with the Byzantine conception of the chief subjects of the New Testament in their original forms, this manuscript in the British Museum supplies the best substitute.

It is a work of the highest order, and was probably written early in the twelfth century. It is so far unique that it combines the most admirable Byzantine art with Western art of equal excellence. There are twenty-four full-page miniatures painted in opaque colours upon gold grounds in the usual Byzantine method, by an artist of considerable ability. The subjects are treated as separate pictures at the commencement of the book. They are all the same size, and are enclosed in narrow rectangular borders of a diaper or tessellated design, and are painted on every succeeding page. The general effect is rich and decorative, showing a considerable knowledge of balance in composition and colour. The colours are somewhat crude, especially the blue which mostly predominates. The same colours are generally used to express the same

BYZANTINE MINIATURES

or similar motives in the composition, light grey-green, for instance, being kept for the more mystical notes. The flesh-colour in these miniatures is notable as being of a lighter and more delicate tone than the usual Byzantine flesh-tint, though the half-tone in some of the heads is unpleasantly green, probably due to the fading of the more delicate colours.

The execution of the miniatures is careful, but unfortunately, like so many other Byzantine paintings, they show patches of flaking and peeling off, due to the amount of solid white with which the colours are mixed and the consequent inflexibility of the pigments, as compared with the vellum.

There are some entirely new motives in this work, for instance in the adoration of the kings—the figure of the angel who is bidding them kneel; also in the next picture, the king departing on horseback with an angel conducting him.

We find in the miniatures of this manuscript excellent examples of the intermingling of Greek and Arabic art: in the picture of the presentation in the Temple, the aged Anna is holding up her right hand in benediction, according to the Greek rite, with a broad scroll in her left hand, containing the Greek words she is speaking, whilst the keel-shaped arch of the cupola of the temple shows the influence of Arabic art. The figures in these miniatures also show a considerable attempt at expression. The two miniatures of Christ on the Cross are dignified in line and comparatively in good proportion, and the one of Christ in crimson toga and azure mantle, showing His wounds to Thomas, is dignified and noble in action, with excellent drapery.

Here it will be well to give a general descriptive criticism of the methods employed by the Byzantine miniaturists. It is most usual for the picture to be painted on a solid gold ground in opaque colours, mixed with white. Their palette as a rule consists of crude pure blue, two reds, a chocolate-brown, and a light

MINIATURES

yellowish brown. The drawing of the figures is usually made in a firm outline, which can be plainly seen, especially in the draperies, in the finished miniature. The flesh-colour is brownish in tone, the heads being carefully shaded and modelled, and though conventional in type, the features are structurally fairly well drawn. They are particularly partial to blue and purple draperies, sometimes introducing a grey-green; these are painted in three tones of colour—white for the lights, the local colour for the half-tones, and a dark shade or black for the shadows. The blues and purples of the draperies are usually carried out in the architectural backgrounds. The brown of the flesh repeats itself in the furniture, etc., and touches of red are introduced in cushions or other small accessories, and as broad lines to enframe the whole miniature. As has been said previously, in a later and decadent period the drawing became more faulty and the draperies more expressionless and elaborated by a mass of Oriental jewel-work.

The next development of illumination is Celtic. As far back as the sixth century we find that Ireland was renowned for its learning and the number of its monasteries. In these schools the Irish created a native style of art, differing entirely from all other styles in the history of illumination. Its great characteristic is a complex rhythm of interlacing spiral and curved coils and bands, knotted and woven together with birds and lacertine animals, the whole effect being a beautiful and intricate maze of curves most accurately and geometrically drawn. The absence of a more constructional design is made up for by this dexterously distributed complexity of curves, and is typical of barbaric art generally.

The 'Book of Kells,' in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin, which derives its name from the St. Columban Monastery of Kells or Kenlis, is an excellent example of Celtic genius under the influence of Christianity. The culminating point of excellence in Celtic art was reached near the end of the seventh century.

CELTIC ILLUMINATIONS

When we come to consider the miniatures of this early Irish period, we are obliged to admit that the barbaric races of the North had none of the magnificent traditions behind them which were the inheritance of the Southern school. They possessed no classical culture, no antique precedents as guides to the drawing of the human figure. On the contrary, they were bound by the absolute and defined limitations of ignorance and their religion. It is small wonder, therefore, if they treated their figures as a pattern, without the knowledge, capacity, or desire to copy the natural form. The features of a face were indicated by a repetition of certain conventional curves; each eyebrow was drawn in a continuous line with one side of the nose, the eyes were merely circles, the mouth but a flourish, and the hair and beard were indicated by spiral curves. The figure was drawn with intersecting lines from which hands and feet protruded, and the only indication of costume was made by the interchanging colours of the various sections which formed the body. In fact, the whole drawing was but a symbolic pattern or design which had the most bizarre appearance. Though such figures, without form or expression, may be barbaric, the technical execution of the miniatures is by no means primitive, and as decorative symbols they are even more satisfying artistically than a badly constructed attempt at an imitation of nature.

The feeling for colour, though limited to the simplest scale of red, blue, green, and yellow, and occasionally admitting violet and pink, is very refined.

Schnaase says that in the early Celtic style, 'the picture was only regarded in the light of so much ornamental writing; it was enough if its meaning could be understood—that is to say, if the spectator felt himself reminded of a sacred personage or scene, and was aware that all this wealth of ornament was used for its glorification.' And in this treatment of the figure, we again see the restrictions put upon primitive pictorial art by the dictates of the Romish Church, which forbade the making

MINIATURES

of an imitative representation of any holy personage lest it should be a means of encouraging a spirit akin to pagan idol worship. The Celtic style was carried from Ireland by St. Columba to Iona, and from thence to Lindisfarne by Aidan, who was made Bishop of that See in 635.

The Durham Book in the British Museum (Cotton MS. Nero D. iv.) was produced at Lindisfarne, to the memory of St. Cuthbert, and is sometimes called 'St. Cuthbert's Gospels.' This manuscript is very nearly equal to the 'Book of Kells' in its minute, delicate ornamentation. One of its most notable characteristics is the monster initials, which take up the whole length of a page. This fancy obtained from the seventh century to the end of the eleventh century, when the initial letter gradually became smaller, giving place to richer and more elaborate borders. The Durham Book, though produced under strong Celtic influence, is classed generally with the Anglo-Celtic school.

It is illuminated with full-page decorative designs, of most minute and elaborate Celtic pattern, sometimes worked into a cruciform shape, and enclosed within an elaborately decorated square with intricate borders and projecting corners. The effect of these pages is that of a very beautiful mosaic; the pigments are bright, but delicate in tint, and for the most part transparent; the black ground, against which the tracery of curves relieves itself, and the gummy varnish with which the colours are mixed, give an enamel and raised quality to the work. Gold is used in minute, beadlike proportions, and very seldom. The accuracy and technical precision of these designs are quite remarkable and leave nothing to be desired. Each of the four gospels is accompanied by a full-page pictured representation of its Evangelist; these are principally interesting as examples of the contrast between the work of the miniaturist and the illuminator of this period. When once the artists leave the precision of the geometrical design, they show themselves absolutely incapable.

ANGLO-CELTIC AND ANGLO-SAXON

The miniaturists here are in a very primitive stage of development, though as compared with Irish work there is a barbaric attempt at realism under a Byzantine and antique influence. All the figures are seated and are accompanied by their respective symbols. The folds of the draperies are not shaded, but are indicated by streaks of a different colour from that in which the robes themselves are painted. The features are drawn in outline, with little constructive knowledge, the eyes being absolutely expressionless circles in almond-shaped curves; the hair is conventionally curled in sculpturesque-like regularity, and the actual execution is careful and firm.

The Celtic style of ornament, after its introduction into this country, became very popular, and, as we shall see, gradually spread its influence throughout all the continental schools.

As early as 597, when Augustine the missionary came over to Romanise the Saxons, he brought many examples of Italian manuscript books with him. He seems to have founded a scriptorium, which was probably in Kent, where Saxon artists were taught what may be called an Anglo-Roman style—Roman draperies being introduced into the miniatures.

Again, later, about 871, King Alfred had seen at Paris the magnificent library of Charlemagne, which imbued him with a desire to possess similar works of art. There already existed at Winchester a scriptorium, which it is said was founded by St. Swithin, Bishop of Winchester, in 852. Alfred, to give a further stimulus to learning and the production of illuminated manuscripts, founded another monastery near the old one at Winchester, which was afterwards called the New Minster.

The beautiful work produced in the two schools at Winchester was a vast improvement upon the continental work of the preceding century. Yet it was really a style which grew naturally out of that practised the century before at Paris and Limoges.

The Duke of Devonshire possesses a magnificent

MINIATURES

example of this style—a Benedictional written by Gode-mann, a monk of the Old Minster of St. Swithin's, at Winchester in 963, for Bishop St. Æthelwold. The miniatures are remarkable for their superior drawing compared with the other English manuscripts of the time. The great initials are in gold, and the titles are in gold or red. The manuscript is enriched with thirty large and splendid illuminated miniatures, all of which have been engraved, and are given by Gage to illustrate the account of the manuscript. The character of the draperies is evidently the result of the influence of classic art.

A very fine example of the rival monastery at New Minster is 'The Golden Book of Edgar,' in the British Museum (Cotton MS. Vesp. A. viii.), written in 966. It is called 'Golden' because the text is in raised gold. The title-page contains figures with flowing drapery, painted on a purplish pink ground; the harmony of colour and constructional design of the whole page are very beautiful. The use of a rich green and an amber yellow in small quantities, and also the jewel-like use of gold, give a richness and quality which are altogether characteristic of Anglo-Saxon illumination. The figures are more primitive in construction and proportion than Byzantine work, and the draperies are cruder in manipulation, but one feels, in spite of this, more vitality and fertility of invention in the motive of these Northern schools.

Byzantine illumination seems to lack much of the craftsmanlike feeling for design and decoration, which is in evidence in even early examples of Celtic, Anglo-Saxon, and Carolingian styles.

The character of the figures in Anglo-Saxon miniatures is largely imbued with Byzantine feeling; they, however, retain an individual character of their own. In their slight and conventional rendering of the human form we see an evident attempt at grace, and sometimes even dramatic action, which is far in advance of the primitiveness of conception of Celtic art with its helpless

NORTHERN SCHOOLS

rigidity. In the Anglo-Saxon miniatures, we find that the faces, though only drawn with a few lines, have a decided aim at a certain type of beauty, and this with little knowledge of construction. In comparing the technical execution of Anglo-Saxon and Byzantine miniatures, the former are usually very much slighter, they are delicately drawn with the pen, and only the flat local colours put on without shadows; whilst the latter are much more solid and painted in body colours, giving shadows, lights, and half-tones, as has already been described.

But to the student of art, who compares the barbaric schools of the North with the semi-classic school of the South, it will be apparent at once that the former possess the vitality essential to a progressive and living style, whilst the latter is but the decadent reflection of an inherited knowledge of the antique, under Eastern influence.

In the eighth and ninth centuries, European art had a great stimulus from Charlemagne, the great Emperor of the German Empire, which included most of what is now called France. Besides being a victorious general who conquered more than half Europe, he was a great patron of learning and the arts, and established schools throughout his empire. He paid great attention to the production of books, even, it is said, assisting in the correction of ancient texts with his own hands. This encouragement created a literary and cultivated court, his own immediate family including some of the most distinguished scholars and artists.

The influence of Charlemagne was as much a moral as an intellectual one: his clear intelligence was incapable of overlooking the abuses of image worship, but, on the other hand, he agreed quite as little with the iconoclasts, or fanatical image-breakers of the East. His convictions are best explained by the phrase, 'We neither destroy pictures nor pray to them,' and thus he relegated pictures to their true position as ornaments of God's house, and in doing so recognised their independent artistic significance.

MINIATURES

Charlemagne invited the Anglo-Saxon monk Alcuin of York to aid him in the direction of the arts. Their principal foundation was the Palatine School at Aix-la-Chapelle, in which was a large and well arranged scriptorium. The artists who were employed at these new schools were rather calligraphers and illuminators than miniaturists, for their skill, generally speaking, in drawing the human figure was very limited. Sir Frederic Madden seems to have been of the opinion that they were chiefly of Italian or German origin, and worked after the model of the Greek school. It is certain that the character of the manuscripts indicates a combination of the Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, and Byzantine schools.

The illuminated manuscripts which were produced either at Aix-la-Chapelle or at Tours, in the Abbey of St. Martin, are remarkable for their splendour. They are mostly written on gilded or purple leaves of vellum and richly painted, and in their skilful treatment of ornamental design can be recognised Anglo-Saxon and Celtic influences.

In *Les Manuscrits*, by Auguste Molinier, there is given a detailed description of a remarkable Carolingian manuscript. It is called the 'Évangeliare' of Charlemagne, of 781 A.D.; it was presented by the scribe Gotescalc to King Charles during a visit of the latter to Rome. It is written in letters of gold on purple parchment, with titles in silver ink. Every page is composed of two columns, enclosed in beautiful borders, imitated apparently from English manuscripts, with designs of foliage that sometimes recall antique ornamentation, but most of the border decorations are formed of interlacing lines of monsters and geometric designs, which are obviously Celtic in origin. Six paintings adorn the volume, four of which represent the Evangelists and their symbols, the fifth Christ in Glory, and the sixth is the Fountain of Life; a sort of kiosque roughly coloured, supported by eight columns and surmounted by a cross, shelters the mystic fountain, at which a stag and some

CAROLINGIAN MINIATURES

birds are drinking; other animals, peacocks, cocks, and ducks cover the background amongst strange-looking plants. The general aspect is singular, and recalls the East in some degree.

There is among the Harleian manuscripts in the British Museum an *Evangelarium* (Harl. 2788), which is written entirely in golden letters of Carolingian character, and called the '*Codex Aureus*.' This valuable work, according to some writers, agrees entirely with the *Evangelarium* executed for Charlemagne, but the figures in this one are better, and it probably belongs to the beginning of the ninth century.

It is interesting to note that in the descriptions of Carolingian manuscripts we have several examples of portraits, more or less allegorically treated. In the famous Charlemagne Bible, the emperor is represented as the Protector of the Church; and in the Psalter of his grandson Charles the Bald, the king is painted in the second miniature under an antique pediment of purple colour.

The Carolingian school employed subjects, types, and individual motives, borrowed in the first instance from the early Christian art of Italy, but it also exhibited an original tendency of discontent at the constant repetition of rigidly established schemes of figures, and endeavoured to realise the appearance of living action and purpose. It was the low stage of knowledge, their ignorance of form and perspective, which hindered artists from clearly representing things as they were, in spite of their practised hands.

The style which was prevalent at the close of the tenth century was produced by a combination of the Byzantine and Celtic schools. Up to this period the decorative motive of the illuminated manuscript in its initial letters, borders, etc., had been far in advance of the skill shown in the more illustrative miniature. The Byzantine school, although possessing qualities which were far superior to any others, depending as it did

MINIATURES

for its inspiration solely on ancient art, had gradually declined.

When we consider the imaginative qualities of the Celtic school, in its decorative illumination and its exquisite manipulation of the most intricate and minute designs, its barbaric and fantastic figure-drawing seems in comparison to be out of all artistic balance. Other styles, although they have definite characteristics, may be considered broadly, in respect to their miniatures, as a combination or modification of these two.

Since the dawn of the Christian era, art had been restricted to the purest symbolism. Whereas the art of the ancients had had an essentially sensuous motive, based upon a close study and an idealised representation of nature, the art which grew from the birth of the Christian faith primarily disregarded the element of pleasure, and existed principally as a symbolic and mystical sign of a new theology.

For centuries after the stability of the Christian Church had been so far assured that it could afford to show a greater tolerance, the arts remained trammelled by the traditions it had created, and it is not till we reach the latter end of the twelfth century that the miniatures can be considered to have reached as high a level as the decorative illuminations.

THE ELEVENTH, TWELFTH, AND THIRTEENTH CENTURIES

In the preceding pages we have seen how the art of illuminating manuscripts originated in a desire to accentuate the initial letter in the ancient writings. We have seen how the art was introduced into southern Europe, and how, in the monastic schools, under the stimulating patronage of emperors and kings, at different periods and in different countries, it grew and developed.

We have seen that the centre of artistic activity during this period was at Constantinople, where there

RELIGIOUS INSPIRATION

was produced a style which, although superior to all others in its inherited knowledge and skill—especially in the miniatures—was trammelled by its slavish adherence to the traditions of classic art and gradually degenerated. At the same time, we have noted how the Northern schools, although weak and barbaric in their figures and miniatures, were strong in their original inspiration for constructive design, and possessed a vitality which the Byzantine school absolutely lacked. Lastly, that whilst Christianity at first stimulated art, it checked the growth of inspiration by practically forbidding any attempt at realistic imitation of holy personages, and discouraging anything but the severest symbolism. In spite of this, in the tenth century the art of miniature had begun to emancipate itself from its trammels, and we are now entering upon that period of our story which is rich in interest for its own sake, and richer still for all that it portends in the history of art.

From the dawn of the Christian era until the middle of the fourteenth century it may be said that there was but one inspiration—religion—and but one motive—decoration. Religion inspired the symbolic treatment of the subject, and the motive of the miniatures was rather to decorate than to illustrate the text. The symbolic and conventional treatment of the figures in the miniatures was in all respects in harmony with this decorative purpose; and, considered as a part of a general scheme of ornamentation, they are, even when stiff and primitive in drawing, not without true artistic value. In the periods which I am about to describe, it will be still more evident that the calligrapher, illuminator, and miniaturist worked in unison to produce as rich and decorative a page as their skill and imagination could devise; and the gradual growth of technical ability in the drawing of figures, architecture and other details, from the eleventh until the fifteenth century, makes this epoch one of increasing interest and value.

In the best examples of the best period of illuminated

MINIATURES

MSS.—that is to say, the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries—we recognise at once that although the miniaturist had reached a very high level of attainment, he still rightly deemed it all-sufficient to conform to the decorative requirements of the illuminated page. He accepted the artistic limitations which his art and the work of his collaborators imposed upon him, and his miniature was harmoniously woven into the fabric of the manuscript as a gem into some exquisite piece of embroidery.

It was not until after the close of the fourteenth century, when the miniaturists had gained greater facility of realistic expression, that we find them beginning to disregard these earlier traditions of decoration, and in the strength of a greater artistic independence, weakening the general decorative effect of the whole page by giving a more graphic and realistic illustration to the text. One of the earliest instances of the ascendancy of the miniaturist as an illustrator is a manuscript of the *Divina Commedia* of Dante of the fourteenth century. It is now in the Egerton collection at the British Museum (Egerton MS. 943).

But to return to the point at which we had arrived. From the close of the tenth century, the Anglo-Saxon school developed an originality of design which was unsurpassed by any of the contemporary continental schools: it was known by the special name of 'Opus Anglicum.' If we wished to express in what its chief charm consisted, it would be best indicated by the words 'constructive design': the borders were rich and heavy in ornamentation, consisting of massive gold bars with decorative foliage intertwining. The miniatures show a more natural treatment, as has been already noted with reference to the excellent example in the possession of the Duke of Devonshire. Another very distinctive feature of Anglo-Saxon art may be seen in the Utrecht Psalter, of which the British Museum possesses a later copy, dating from the eleventh century. It is filled with delicate out-

MONASTIC PERIOD

line drawings in three colours—red, blue, and green—showing a great facility and freedom. It seems evident that this eleventh century copy was done as an improvement on the earlier manuscript. We find that the initial letters are far more elaborate in design and are illuminated with colour. There is no decorative intention in these drawings; they are not even enclosed in lines; but they show a considerable attempt at dramatic action and grouping. If we compare them with another manuscript in the Cottonian collection, 'The Psychomachia' of Aurelius Prudentius (Cott. MS. Cleop. C. viii.), a Latin poem on the conflict between the virtues and vices of the soul, we see here the same method of work, but a distinctly more decorative treatment. The figures are larger and designed to fit a panel-shaped illustration, enclosed within double lines, the heads and other extremities of the drawing being allowed to overlap the margin, which adds to their action and expression. In this last manuscript the outlines are in two colours—brown and red—and the draperies are arranged in a good though stiff classical style.

The peculiar characteristics of Anglo-Saxon illuminated MSS. were retained, with certain French modifications, until the end of the fourteenth century.

From the end of the ninth century until the beginning of the thirteenth, the art of illuminating was exclusively confined to the monasteries, and these three centuries may be considered as constituting the best monastic period.

The styles underwent great changes during this long epoch. One recognises little resemblance at the first glance between a manuscript of the ninth century and a volume executed in the thirteenth. The writing is quite different, and in the ornamentation of the latter period we find Roman art in its decline; on the other hand, the illuminator of the ninth century has drawn his inspiration from different sources. The inferiority of the figure-drawing, which is so often apparent in the monastic period, is to be explained by the kind of artistic education which the

MINIATURES

monks received. The only school for an artist is the direct study of nature, but for nature the miniature painters of this epoch cared little. They knew by tradition what attributes and what costumes to give the principal personages of the Old and New Testament, but they seem to have known nothing of the proportion of the figure. The extremities are always disproportionate, the heads either too square or too oval, but always exaggerated. In the tenth and eleventh centuries the bodies are generally squat and the heads enormous. Later on the painters fell into the contrary error.

The peculiarities of Anglo-Saxon art were modified in England after the Conquest, and a strong leaning manifested itself towards the French school, with its richer ornamentation and fantastic initial letters. In France the figure-drawing of this period is often comparatively good, the limbs being well proportioned and the more natural folds of the drapery suggesting the form beneath.

During the eleventh and twelfth centuries there was a great revival in Italian art, of which two distinct schools existed. One seems to have originated in the North, and shows the intricate interlacing of Irish work, with the enormous initial letters so characteristic of it, and the other evidently spread from the South, and was quite Byzantine in character. Neither of these Italian schools produced many miniatures, but the few that exist are fairly well executed.

As I have already said, down to the thirteenth century, nearly all the manuscripts were written and illuminated by monks, but about the time of Philip Augustus (1180 A.D. to 1223) great changes took place. Instead of monastic schools, universities were founded, the two largest of which were those of Paris and Bologna, and the love of learning spread rapidly. This stimulated the production of books and gave impulse to a new industry—that of bookselling—which became very flourishing in the university towns.

This new order of things, as was natural, had a great

THE GOTHIC STUDY OF NATURE

influence on the art of the miniaturist. Another important cause or sign of the transformation in mediæval art, was the rise and influence of Gothic principles manifesting themselves in the arts of painting and sculpture.

During the Romanesque period it had been Germany that took the lead and set the standard in architecture, and still more in the other manual arts. Gothic, on the other hand, is French in its origin as in its developments. The Roman style, which in architecture had yielded nearly half a century since to the Gothic, now disappeared from the manuscripts, and the ornamentation became more varied and naturalistic. In a word, the miniaturists returned to the study of nature.

There is no doubt that the miniaturists of the thirteenth century sometimes tried to give a personal character to their paintings of the human countenance, but unfortunately the artist was not clever enough to seize and reproduce the real character of a physiognomy. Louis ix., for instance, figures frequently in the miniatures of the end of the thirteenth and beginning of the fourteenth centuries, and yet there cannot be said to exist a single portrait, in the modern sense of the word, of this king.

In the twelfth century there was a prevailing fashion for large folios with a bold text, and miniatures and borders on a proportionately grand scale. In the thirteenth century we find a return to small volumes full of detail and minute finish, and a text which was appropriately small in character. The fact that vellum at this time was very scarce and dear may account in some measure for this diminution in scale. Paper did not compete successfully with vellum until the fourteenth century.

The miniatures, necessarily very small, were frequently introduced into the interior of initial letters, in square frames and medallions along the sides; the backgrounds are often of raised burnished gold, which was probably obtained by coating the vellum with a thick

MINIATURES

layer of white and size, and rubbing it down very smooth, the hard surface thus obtained admitting of a great degree of burnish. This century is also notable for a variety of different treatments of the backgrounds. The delicate and careful diaper-work gradually superseded the solid gold, and was incomparably preferable for relieving and setting off the figures, and it represents the finest period of the decorative miniature in the illuminated manuscript; its decorative feeling was in artistic conformity with the flat ornamentation of a page. Painters also show a liking for architectural backgrounds, often placing their figures under a Gothic canopy. There also begin to appear ornamental borders of delicate design, first as growths from the initial letters, and gradually creeping further and further round the text.

As an example of our late thirteenth century English school of illumination and miniature, I can hardly do better than refer to the 'Tenison Psalter' (Add. MS. 24,686) in the British Museum. This manuscript, which perhaps reaches the climax of our own school, was probably executed for Alfonso, son of Edward I., on his contemplated marriage with Margaret, daughter of Florentius, Count of Holland. Three leaves inserted at the beginning contain twelve miniatures of saints, four on a page, and eighteen miniatures of the life of Christ, six on a page: the latter are only a little bigger than postage stamps, pasted into compartments of tessellated patterns. The execution of the figures is in careful pen-lines upon a prepared ground of white, the flesh being left uncoloured. The draperies are tinted in delicate colour and are expressive in form and arrangement, the folds being indicated by pen-lines without shadows. The backgrounds, which are of diaper designs or gold, are rich and harmonious. The beautiful large initial letters to the text ramify out into strong branches of conventional design with delicate foliated twigs and leaves, on which are balanced most realistically drawn birds and animals or quaint grotesques. The colouring

TENISON AND ARUNDEL PSALTERS

throughout is sober and dignified, and rich raised gold enhances the general effect. At the end of the book we find the most interesting addition of the artist's signature—'Will Devoniensis scripsit istum librum.'

The pages of this manuscript are $9\frac{1}{2}$ by $6\frac{1}{2}$ inches, so they are larger than the usual French manuscripts of this period.

Another Psalter which is similar in treatment to this one, but a little later, being early fourteenth century, is known as the 'Arundel Psalter' (Arundel MS. 83). Here the miniatures are even better than those in the foregoing description, but the initial letters and decorations are simpler and less varied. The draperies of the miniatures are exceptionally graceful, and the design and composition are well balanced and in the best sense decorative.

Up to this century, the records of art are almost destitute of names of miniaturists. Their works are for the most part unsigned monuments of the patience and love which they had for their art, and as they lived, so have they been content that posterity shall know them—by their works alone. There are a few artists of the thirteenth century whose names have come down to us, through the careful researches of writers on the subject.

It has been only comparatively of recent date that any Englishman has taken up the study of this subject sufficiently to fathom the accuracy of the statements made by such enthusiastic biographers as Vasari. We now possess Mr. J. W. Bradley's excellent dictionary of miniature painters. Bradley successfully challenges the accuracy of many previous writers, and only those who have attempted the task of reaching 'truth at the bottom of the well' can realise how much he has done.

The task of verifying the names of artists, and specially miniaturists of the Middle Ages, is no sinecure. It is a source of some amusement, if a little troublesome, to note the various appellations which artists are known by. The spelling alone has been the cause of great

MINIATURES

variation of opinions, and the custom of calling artists after a town—which they may have been born in or only worked in—leads to considerable confusion of ideas. This confusion is doubled when referring to miniaturists whose reputation depends on so slender a thread as the illumination of MSS., which may have passed through many vicissitudes since their creation, and were valued more from a literary point of view.

Alphonse Labitte mentions two Englishmen belonging to this century, Mancirius and Nicolas Treveth. He also gives the names of some Italian miniaturists, though not all that are known. There were the monk Conrad de Scheyren, Diotisalvi, Duccio di Buoninsegna his partner, Sire Jehan, Baudouin, Guiot de Hovre, Nicolas, Taddeo Gaddi, Don Lorenzo, a monk of the Camaldulense Monastery of the Angeli at Florence, and Franco Bolognese. Diotisalvi and Duccio were Sienese painters.

The monk Conrad de Scheyren, mentioned above, was evidently an artist of considerable talent and industry. He became Prior of the Abbey of Scheyren, in Bavaria, in 1206, and devoted his life to the transcription and illumination of a great number of manuscripts, some of which are now in the Royal Library at Munich. There appear to have been several others who were comparatively well known: Pedro de Pamplona, a Spanish artist who wrote a Bible in two volumes, enriched with barbaric brilliancy, for Alfonso x., the learned King of Leon and Castile; Fra Bartolomeo Guiscolo, a Franciscan of Parma, who worked as an illuminator in France in 1248; and William of Devon, the artist of the Tenison Psalter, who also wrote a Latin Bible, now in the British Museum (Roy. I. d. i.). This book contains exquisite illuminated initials with bracket ornaments on which are perched grotesques and quaint birds. The initials contain minute pictures, with figures most delicately drawn in pen-line.

The new impulse in art which is so apparent throughout the thirteenth century, and which makes it

CIMABUE AND GIOTTO

so important, is especially associated in Italy with the names of Cimabue, born in 1240, and his greatest pupil, Giotto, born in 1266. With the help of these two artists, Italy severed herself for all time from Byzantine traditions. Cimabue was not without predecessors, though in his work we see a great improvement and an evident attempt to imitate nature. He is credited by some writers with having painted miniatures in several manuscripts.

With Giotto the history of Italian art really commences, for he freed himself almost completely from Byzantine traditions.

There is a small volume in the British Museum ('Lives of the Saints,' Add. MS. 27,428) which belongs to the early fourteenth century, and is the work of Italian artists of the school of Giotto. It contains panel miniatures which stretch across the single column of text, and are usually about 4 inches by $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches. The colouring is rich and very beautiful; the balance between the mellow reds and the cool greys, blues, and greens being finely maintained with a peculiarly Italianesque quality. They are painted on a background of gold. The heads, which are modelled in monochrome and tinted with carnations, possess considerable character; the draperies are well arranged and carefully painted, the two miniatures on page 58 being exceptionally good examples. All of the initial letters in this volume contain a miniature of a head, or group of heads, the whole letter being let into a square panel of gold, ramifying out into a heavy flamboyant foliage which spreads up and round the margin and is harmoniously coloured.

A manuscript in the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge, purchased in 1876, has on its modern binding the following inscription:—'Juris Canonici cum splendidissimis picturis Giotti Florentini,' and on the strength of this, no doubt, the miniatures have been attributed to Giotto, but they are quite unworthy of such a painter,

MINIATURES

and vastly inferior to those in the small volume just mentioned.

This period should not be passed over without mention being made of the Sienese miniaturists, of whom there existed a flourishing school. In the thirteenth century, Simone Martini, Lippo Memmi, and Niccolo di Ser Sozzo Tagliacci of the Duccio school, produced beautiful examples of miniature. In the succeeding centuries the names of other distinguished painters follow, such as Sano di Pietro, his pupil Pellegrini di Mariano, called Rossini, Francesco di Giorgio Martini, Matteo di Giovanni, Giovanni di Paolo, and his pupil Guidoccio Cozzarelli. In the archives of the Comune di Siena and of the Palazzo Municipale may be seen examples of many of these painters' works.

THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

The fourteenth century carried to still greater maturity the developments of the last, and introduced many new features and improvements in the character of the illuminations. There was a far greater vitality shown in the motives which inspired the decoration and ornamentation of books. In the art of manuscript painting in this century the miniatures take a more important part in the decoration, and they are often contained in an architectural border. We still find that the subjects are placed on a background of gold or diaper pattern, but occasionally we see that the artists use landscape backgrounds, though in these there is little indication of the realism of treatment and knowledge of perspective and chiaroscuro which is shown a hundred years later.

The Renaissance was slowly but surely budding and putting forth new leaves, but it was still to be many years before the seed which was sown by Cimabue and Giotto developed into vigorous maturity and blossomed with its later luxuriance.

The Southern art of Italy took time to ripen : the ill-

NEW FEATURES IN MINIATURES

proportioned Byzantine figures were long in yielding completely to greater truth and study of nature. Their influence, which had warped the Italian artists' appreciation of nature for so many centuries, seems to have retarded their endeavours to attain greater perfection and vitality. Notwithstanding this, we see signs of the new effort in the superior colour and drawing in the miniatures of this century. Whilst the Italian school contrived to combine a closer study of nature with a truer though traditional appreciation of classic forms, the Northern schools put greater reliance on nature alone, and their art was more individual and realistic.

Of the many new features to be discovered in the illuminations of this period, perhaps the ivy-leaf borders are the most charming, as they are certainly the most decorative. This border was made an especial feature in many of the finest French manuscripts to the end of the fifteenth century. Its sparkling delicacy and lacy uniformity were peculiarly successful as a framework for texts or miniatures, and undoubtedly helped to enhance the rich, pure colouring of the latter.

The grotesque was also a new development used in the borders and initial letters; and we also find two new treatments applied to the miniatures—the 'Grisaille' and the 'Cameo.' The last named has been attributed to the influence of enamelling, and both may be said to be paintings in monochrome, grey and white, with slight indications of colour in sky or background, or, as in the cameo, a monochrome painting in relief on a coloured background of diaper-work or gold. The most important of all the innovations, in its influence on the ultimate development of the art of illumination, was the departure from the beaten track of religious subjects and the inclusion of secular books. Henceforth artists illuminated and painted romances, songs and other subjects, and the treatment necessary for these manuscripts helped to give a more natural and realistic manner, in contradistinction to the traditional symbolic style which had been con-

MINIATURES

sidered essential to sacred subjects. Indications of the progress which was gradually being effected can also be seen in the accessories, implements, and utensils, all of which show that the miniaturist was slowly attaining a mastery over the technical difficulties of pictorial art. But the most interesting indication that artists were seriously inspired by nature is to be found in the portrayal of the figures and faces. Here we see the initial striving after individuality and expression, and the features were modelled with shadows and half-tones in place of mere outline drawing.

During the early part of this century the French schools retained their position as the most flourishing centres of activity for the production of illuminated books, and during the reign of Charles v. the number of such books executed was very large. This king, the real founder of the Bibliothèque Nationale, exerted all his intelligence to procure the most beautiful illuminated books. We may judge of the esteem in which the French miniaturists were held during the latter half of the fourteenth century by the fact that Froissart, the historian, sent his chronicles to France to be illuminated, in particular the beautiful copy that he intended for Henry iv., King of England, but which was seized by the Duke of Anjou in 1381. Guillaume de Bailly, one of the many miniaturists whose work is unknown to us, was entrusted with the execution of this copy. These facts are further evidence to show that the French miniaturists of this period were of recognised superiority to those of Flanders, Brabant, or of Hainault, which was the home of Froissart. M. Lacroix has written of this epoch : ' The study of miniatures in the fourteenth century is of peculiar interest on account of the scenes of public and private life, and the habits and customs there reproduced. Portraits from the life became more numerous, and the caricature, afterwards such a powerful influence in France, first came into use.'

We have seen how the focussing centre of the art of

THE NETHERLANDISH SCHOOL

illumination has shifted from one country to another, due in great measure to the stimulus it received at the hands of the reigning monarch and other royal patrons. Towards the end of the fourteenth century the art centre of Europe again showed its peripatetic tendency. Bruges was at this time practically the commercial centre of Europe, as it was also the trysting-place of all the wealth and learning. Here the fine arts, together with all other skilled crafts, found great patronage; and it is to this capital of the Low Countries that we have to look for the founders of modern painting and the inventors of its processes and methods. It is in this city, encircled by its magic moat, spanned by innumerable bridges, with its towers, spires, and battlements, its guilds, its portly merchants, and complacent burgo-masters, that the art of Jan Van Eyck and his many brilliant followers had its origin, an art which spread its influence over all Europe. This new school took root and blossomed, astonishing and delighting other nations by its originality and its fearless seeking after truth.

Hubert Van Eyck was born in 1366 and died in 1426. His brother, Jan Van Eyck, was born about 1386 and died in 1440, and Margaretta, their sister, seems to have died some time before 1432, but the date of her death remains an uncertainty. As to their claim to be miniaturists or illuminators, there is considerable variance of opinion. It is, however, pretty certain that the crucial test for Netherlandish miniaturists is the fact of their names appearing in the Registers of the Illuminators' Guild at their place of residence. Hubert Van Eyck is the only one of the family whose name can be traced, and in 1422 he was made member of a guild at Ghent. Waagen asserts that all three worked on the breviary of the Duke of Bedford, now in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, but this is extremely doubtful. Other writers also say that Hubert executed one painting in a manuscript, 'L'Étrif

MINIATURES

de Vertu et de Fortune,' now at the Imperial Library, St. Petersburg.

Whether we can consider these distinguished artists as miniaturists or not matters little, when allowing for the important influence of their genius on the art of their time and all succeeding periods.

Jan Van Eyck was undoubtedly the greatest of the three. He threw aside tradition; Byzantine Madonnas had no charm for him. A faithful imitation of nature and a love of truth distinguish his work, and in this respect as in many others he was the true founder of the Netherlandish school.

This school includes the phalanx of artists who followed in the footsteps of their master. Some were undoubtedly 'master painters,' who also practised miniature painting, and of these we may mention such men as Roger Vander Weyden, born in 1400 and a pupil of Van Eyck, and a little later Hans Memling, whom, as I have already said, many authorities credit with having painted several noteworthy examples of miniature, but there exists absolutely no proof that he actually executed them. Hans Memling was born about 1430, so he must be considered as belonging to the fifteenth century.

The technical characteristics of the new Flemish school of painting had much in common with the art of illumination. It possessed all the richness and purity of colour, the simplicity of tone and surface, the flatness and decorative balance so essential to illuminative or miniature art, but it possessed other and far greater qualities besides. It was full of the character and inspiration which only a close and penetrating study of nature can give. It displayed an accuracy in drawing the human form and countenance which is unrivalled. It sought to render the varied types of the human race with the utmost exactitude, and yet, with all its realistic tendencies, it possessed a power of reserve and selection in its methods, which lifts the most ordinary subjects out of the commonplace. We still see a lingering feeling of

ITALIAN AND FLEMISH SCHOOLS

archaic inaction in the figures which, united with the study of nature, adds dignity and sublimity to Madonnas and saints evidently painted from Flemish types.

It was towards the close of the fourteenth century that the schools of painting were founded, which sowed the seed of the Renaissance: these schools were the French, Italian, and Flemish. The French school was the first to be constituted, and it was still at its best period in 1350. It was to Paris that every one came who desired to purchase fine manuscripts; most of the beautiful breviaries, hours, and missals executed at this time came from Parisian studios.

The Italian and the Flemish or Netherlandish schools, which were in their comparative infancy, represent the two poles of art. The Italian painters—disciples of Giotto and the school of Siena—early distinguished themselves by the striving after the ideal. Their attempts were often banal, but in seeking their inspiration directly from the antique they had more science than their rivals, drew more correctly and with a greater refinement of feeling. The Flemish painters, on the other hand, having no such antique monuments before their eyes, such as abound in Italy, turned to the study of nature and produced a multitude of compositions which, although sometimes approaching the vulgar, are full of strength and truth.

This superiority was fully appreciated throughout the other continental schools. The influence of the artists of Flanders and Hainault continued to increase in France and Germany during two centuries; it even reached the north of Italy and Spain. To this favourable influence many historians attribute in part the marvellous improvement in the art of Lombardy, Venice, and Ferrara in the fifteenth century.

In France during the middle of the fourteenth century the influence of the Netherlandish school was very marked. King John still employed Frenchmen to execute his manuscripts, but in the reign of Charles v. there were

MINIATURES

artists from Flanders working in Paris, such as Jean de Bruges.

The king's brother, Jean de Berri, invited artists of all conditions from Italy, and accepted presents of manuscripts by Italian artists; but it was to the painters of the Low Countries—André Beauneveu, Pol de Limbourg, and Jacquemart de Hesdin, that he entrusted the task of illustrating the most beautiful of his manuscripts. Of these three artists only the first named can be said to be celebrated.

André Beauneveu was of Valenciennes. He was a sculptor, and it is known that he was commissioned by Charles v. to execute the tomb of Philippe iv. and of Jean le Bon at Saint Denis, and also that of Charles himself and his wife, Jeanne de Bourbon. Beauneveu was also a painter, and in 1390 he was in the service of the Duc de Berri, and superintended at Mehun sur Yèvre the decorating of the splendid palace of this prince. He probably executed at this time part of the illuminations of two manuscripts. One of these, preserved at Brussels, contains two paintings by Beauneveu; the other is a magnificent psalter, richly illustrated. It is said that the paintings at the commencement of the latter are by the hand of André Beauneveu; they are executed in grisaille on a diapered background, and offer all the characteristics of the Flemish school.

Bradley says that Beauneveu was the precursor of Fouquet, and that these two masters and their contemporaries are the creators of the French school of miniaturists, whose later masterpiece was the grand 'Hours of Anne of Brittany.' In fact, they form the true French school as distinguished from the Italianised school of Fontainebleau.

It may be noted of Pol de Limbourg and Jacquemart de Hesdin, both of whom are associated with Beauneveu in the employ of the Duc de Berri, that there is in the Bodleian Library at Oxford a prayer-book which shows so much similarity to several prayer-books in

A REVOLUTIONARY EPOCH

which pictures by Pol de Limbourg and his brother occur, as to make it probable that some of the miniatures proceed from those masters.

I will here give some names of miniaturists which have been well authenticated as belonging to the fourteenth century:—Jean le Noir and his daughter Bourget, illuminators to Charles v. ; Jean de Bruges, who is said to have painted a page of a Bible for the same king in 1372; Jean Flamel; Girart d'Orleans, painter to King John; Jacquemin, called Gringonneur, member of the Academy of Saint-Luc, painter to Charles vi., and perhaps the inventor of playing-cards; the brothers Manuel; Oudin de Carvanoy, the illuminator of the 'Pélerinage Jésus-Crist,' and of the second part of the 'Chroniques de Saint Denis'; Henri de Trevoux; Jean Pucelle, and the celebrated Christine de Pisan, born at Venice in 1363.

THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY

The fifteenth century is in many ways an epoch of revolutionary tendencies in art—or perhaps it would be better expressed by the word developments. Undoubtedly one of the most important of these developments was the study of perspective.

The absence of a knowledge of this science had in a great measure governed the treatment which was possible in the artistic expression of a subject. It had checked the imitative and illustrative tendency, and indirectly stimulated the inventive and decorative spirit. This was altogether in accord with the best and most appropriate scheme for decorating books. All through the Middle Ages we see the 'distinction' which was obtained by the harmony existing between the text and decoration of manuscripts. The two were inseparably linked together in a unity of purpose, and their growth and development were contiguous and inherent to the book itself. We must also remember that all-important fact in the creation of

MINIATURES

a work of art, that every part was due solely to manual dexterity, and also that the cost of production in time and money was of little or no moment.

The chief promoters of the study of perspective were Pietro della Francesca and Paolo Uccello, of Florence. The latter neglected almost entirely every other department of art for this study, and all his principal works went to exemplify its value. Pietro della Francesca seems to have been the first who reduced it to a practical system.

Another and not less important essential to art, which had been wanting in the school of Giotto, was a proper understanding of light and shade. This was in a great measure supplied by Masolino da Panicale (1383-1440), who executed some excellent works for the period in the chapel of San Pietro, in the church of S. Maria del Carmine at Florence. Masolino is said to have been the master of the celebrated Masaccio, who, if such a distinction can be claimed for an individual artist, deserves more than any other the title of the Father of Modern Painting. The style of Masaccio was, in the common acceptance of the term, 'modern.' His composition was dramatic, his form and character were individual, and in the more external qualities of art his representations were natural. This cannot be said of any previous painter. The contemporaries of Masaccio, whose work contributed most to the establishment of the modern school of art, were Fra Giovanni da Fiesole, known as Fra Angelico, Benozzo Gozzoli, and Fra Filippo Lippi. Fra Angelico was born in 1387 and died in 1455. Although it is clear that Fra Angelico's early training was gained under the influence of the school of miniaturists belonging to the great house of Santa Maria degli Angeli, and that he probably executed miniatures, there are none existing now that can be confidently ascribed to him. At the same time the first or Gothic period of his art, as Professor Langton Douglas has so well pointed out, is 'impregnated with many of the characteristics of miniature painting.'

The study of linear perspective, and light and shade,

JEAN FOUQUET

which commenced in all seriousness with the early Renaissance masters, had a far-reaching effect on the art of painting. It was not long before the miniaturist and illuminator of manuscripts reflected the developments in other branches of painting, and the fifteenth century is one of great technical excellence, and a gradual ascendancy of the realistic over the decorative treatment in the decoration of books, especially in the Northern schools. During this century the miniature became more and more pictorial, and occupied by far the most important part in the decoration. In many instances the borders even adopted this new realism to such an extent that they were more imitative than the miniature, and instead of designed conventions we get carefully painted flowers, animals and insects, with all the semblance of actuality; whilst the miniatures, though giving accurate pictorial representations of landscapes, buildings, etc., often retained true decorative balance in their general treatment and composition.

If, as we have seen, the Italian school of painting showed renewed vitality and inspiration in the fifteenth century, there were two other schools of equal or even greater importance. The Flemish school, headed by the incomparable Van Eycks, had risen to a world-renowned position, and the French school, which to a certain extent combined the best qualities of the two first, was still at its height, and possessed amongst its most celebrated artists Jean Fouquet, who was born at Tours in 1415, and who died there about the year 1480. M. de Laborde says: 'In the figures of Fouquet, who was as conscientious a painter as Memling, and a closer observer of nature, may be traced some of the more solid qualities of this delightful painter. In his landscape he surpasses Van Eyck in a knowledge of aerial perspective and a comprehension of the resources of nature.'

It seems difficult to give the palm to any one of these three great schools which flourished during the first half of the fifteenth century. Up to this century the

MINIATURES

Low Countries had shown no individuality or great excellence in illumination. In many respects it was distinctly behind the other countries—poor in design and colour, and the drawing of the figure crude, heavy, and inartistic. But under the influence of the Van Eycks, the Flemish school awoke into new life, and excelled in reproducing the characteristic physiognomies of the princes and nobles of the court of Burgundy.

The French school was hardly less realistic in its types, yet it idealised them to some extent, and was particularly happy in its execution of the ornamental parts. On the other hand, the Italian school was very successful in combining the study of nature with the imitation of the antique.

Fouquet was certainly the greatest representative of the French school at this date, but we must not overlook the fact that he was influenced by the Flemish and Italian schools. He belongs to the former by the absolute realism which dominates all his productions, and he seems to have borrowed some of his motives from the latter. Dr. Propert says: 'His architectural backgrounds bear the mark of his Italian study, an influence which is also apparent in the graceful disposition of the figures of his groups, and the symmetry of his general composition.' Although, like the Flemish, he copied nature with scrupulous fidelity, and clothed his ancient personages in the costumes of contemporary fashion, he was more skilful than they in his arrangements and knowledge of composition, and as a colourist possessed considerable power of selection and distinction. His use of a mellow scarlet as the principal note of colour, tempered by buff in the tunics of the men-at-arms, and a variety of neutral greys in other portions of the picture, shows us a scheme which is daring and successful.

It is known that Fouquet visited Italy, and while there studied under Antonio Filarete, being entrusted by his master with the task of painting the portrait of Pope Eugenius iv.

THE SHREWSBURY BOOK

There is a Limoges enamel in the Louvre which represents Fouquet at about the age of thirty, with an inscription above the head, 'Johès Fouquet.' The number of his authentic works is very small, but the finest productions are the famous miniatures in the 'Book of Hours' of Étienne Chevalier, Treasurer of France under Charles VII.

It is interesting to follow the changes which have taken place in this fascinating art of miniature painting since the time when Charlemagne, in imitation of the emperors of the East, caused manuscripts to be decorated. The manuscripts belonging to the kings who succeeded him, the liturgical books of the bishoprics, abbeys, and religious communities, prove that the Carolingian style continued in vogue until the reign of King John, who, by his marriage with Bonne de Luxembourg, Duchess of Limbourg, introduced the Flemish school, which gave a different character to French art. His sons, King Charles V., the Duke of Anjou, the Duke of Berri, and the Duke of Burgundy, all celebrated bibliophiles, encouraged and stimulated the taste for illuminated manuscripts in France.

The French princes were not the only royal patrons of letters and art of this century. In England, Edward III., Richard II., Henry IV., and the Duke of Bedford protected and encouraged painters and writers; but in this country, due to the increased intercourse between the English and French people, consequent on the occupation of France by Henry V., English art became saturated with French influence.

The Shrewsbury Book in the British Museum (Roy. MS. 15 E. vi.) is a specimen of English work produced under French influence. It was executed for John Talbot, Earl of Shrewsbury, and presented by him to Margaret of Anjou after her marriage with Henry VI. It is a book of romances of chivalry, and contains a portrait of the earl presenting his book to Queen Margaret.

The miniatures in this volume are treated in an

MINIATURES

earlier style than that of the French and Flemish miniatures of the same period. The figures are of the quaint, stiff, conventional type, good in proportion, but lacking the individualistic character and the depth and solidity of modelling of the Flemish school, or the idealised grace of the French. We have here the diaper backgrounds and tessellated pavements so prevalent in the fourteenth and fifteenth century French miniatures, and also the same delicate, spiky ivy-leaf borders in raised gold, decoratively interwoven with semi-realistic flowers, which French artists used with such skill. It is interesting to notice that the English pink-tipped daisy is made much use of in these borders. The miniatures in the double column of text are generally about 4 inches by 3 inches, on a page of $18\frac{1}{2}$ inches by 13 inches: they are beautifully designed with a decorative motive. The colour is rich, pure, and harmonious, with a skilful use of gold and silver in the armour and draperies, and the greens and blues are of a softer, more mellow hue than we find in pure French work. The architecture is mediæval, drawn with a conventional disregard for perspective. The horses are mostly of the rocking-horse type, standing on their back legs and pawing the air with their front ones. The landscapes are of willow-pattern simplicity in their geographical formation, the skies are a pattern, the water is a pattern, the trees are decorative shrubs, and yet with all, these miniatures are full of dramatic incident and illustrative purpose, and give us the keenest pleasure as decorations. They are, in fact, illuminations in the true sense of the word, and their motive is expressed in the simple language of decorative convention. We see in this volume that the figures are much slighter in their treatment than those of continental schools, which is a general characteristic of English work.

The tendencies I have noted towards pictorial realism, though showing a healthy activity in the close study of nature, must be looked upon as an artistic degeneracy, when carried too far, in their application to the decoration

DEATH-BLOW TO ILLUMINATION

of books. Imitative art has ever been antagonistic to the truest principles of decoration, since the latter must inevitably conform to certain defined laws of appropriate convention. It will always be a point of the subtlest speculation, how far the imitative may trespass upon the conventional—using the latter term in its truest technical sense. It is true, without a doubt, that the greatest masters of the greatest schools have known by an innate intuition, rather than by precept, how to leave out the unessential and express themselves with a vigorous simplicity which becomes in reality an individual convention.

It is reasonable to believe, when we study the trend of art at this period, that the better class of miniaturists were gradually weaned from the decoration of books and became independent artists, painting portraits and pictures, or even frescoes. Be this true or not, the invention of printing about the middle of the fifteenth century may certainly be considered as the fateful death-blow to the ancient art of illumination, and though it survived for some time, its waning vitality will be only too apparent as I continue the thread of my narrative.

CHAPTER II

THE INVENTION OF PRINTING—ITS INFLUENCE ON THE
ART OF THE MINIATURISTS—THE ITALIAN SCHOOL
AND THE RENAISSANCE—ITS INFLUENCE ON OTHER
SCHOOLS—THE FRENCH SCHOOL—THE FLEMISH
SCHOOL.

IT is outside the scope of this volume to give an exhaustive account of the miniatures painted as part of the illumination of books. So large and interesting a subject is one which can only be studied adequately in a volume exclusively devoted to the subject.

My intention rather is to encourage a study and appreciation of the art of miniature painting in its widest sense, in order to show how each phase and development of the art is inseparably linked with the preceding and succeeding ones, and as a natural consequence leads finally to the ultimate and more familiar phase, the portrait miniature of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries.

Primarily, therefore, I wish to trace the evolution of portraiture through the manuscript miniatures, and discover, if possible, what causes were guiding artists towards a more individualistic interpretation of character and a more realistic expression of nature. If we gather by the way a little of the inspiration inherent in these jewelled manuscripts, if we appreciate the spirit of enthusiasm which promoted their production, and catch something of its infection, then we shall be in a position the better to understand the masterly qualities possessed by the portrait miniaturists of the later periods.

As I have noted already, there was a gradual

GREATER REALISM

change being effected in the treatment of the decoration of manuscripts from the beginning of the fifteenth century. This was due to several causes working towards the same end: the inclusion of secular subjects, the closer study of nature, the study of the science of perspective and chiaroscuro, and a fuller knowledge of light and shade and composition. All these things helped forward this change. It was in reality the last step in the art's progress from the severest symbolism to illustrative realism, from decorative invention to imitative art. In other words, it was a tendency for the 'decorated' book to become an 'illustrated' book.

Artists, who up to the thirteenth century had been content with tradition, had now emancipated themselves. They had learned to see nature for themselves and in their own way. They had found new beauties, new renderings, and their discoveries gave them a greater independence. This independence, with its new vitality, refused to adapt itself to the limited and traditional treatment necessary for the decoration of a page. Hence, as we shall see, we find technical academic excellence taking the place of convention and conformity.

We must not suppose that the change came in a day, or that it was absolute or universal, but the truth is reflected, as in a hand mirror, in the work of the best miniaturists of this epoch. They strove to realise pictorially the scenes, the customs, and the characters which they daily saw around them, often with a great sense of beauty, and still with much decorative feeling.

If this sense of realism was the growing characteristic of the Netherlandish painters, we must remember that it was the realism of accurate and masterly draughtsmanship, as well as of a faithful and uncompromising delineation of character. There are still evident the selection, composition, and reserve in the general treatment which are essential to a work of art, and which in our modern realism seem so often entirely absent. But if the miniatures of the Flemish school showed signs of

MINIATURES

decadence, the Italian school was still at its zenith, and remained so long after the French and Flemish had declined. At the end of the fifteenth century most of the famous Italian cities, such as Florence, Siena, Mantua, Bologna, Ferrara, Verona, and Naples, possessed well-defined schools of manuscript decoration. These schools of Italian miniaturists followed closely on the heels of the great Renaissance painters, and in fact some of the greatest names of this period, such as Leonardo da Vinci, Michael Angelo, and Raphael are associated with the art. The first named undoubtedly executed miniatures and instructed others in the art, but the proof of the two last named having done so is still wanting.

The year 1454 stands remarkable as the approximate date of the introduction of printing into Europe, which helped in no small measure to bring about the upheaval in the relationship of miniaturists, calligraphers, and illuminators in the book market. Walter Crane has said :—‘The immediate forerunners of printed books were the block books—the first faint utterances soon to grow into strong, clear, and perfect speech, to rule the world of books and men.’ ‘The art of these rude and primitive block books, when compared with the highly finished work of the illuminated manuscripts of the same period, might belong to another and earlier century.’

In speaking of the effect of printing on the profession of miniature painting, M. Didot, a French writer, says :—‘The invention of printing threatened to deprive the miniaturists of their means of existence; they therefore sought to co-operate with the printers, who were very glad of their assistance, and reserved corners in their pages to be filled up by the artists. For the latter it was an opportunity of escaping from the circle of religious subjects in which they had continually revolved. The ancient authors were now admirably illustrated by these master draughtsmen. They nevertheless could not represent the costumes of the ancients; but in spite of these anachronisms—which are venerated by us to-day

PRINTING AND WOOD-ENGRAVING

because they reproduce the costumes of the Middle Ages — they have left imperishable artistic monuments. Their work is chiefly instinct with the love of nature, and their beautiful landscapes are full of truth and poetry, and eloquent of their fondness for clear air and sunlight. . . . But printing gradually diminished the number of miniaturists, who began to abandon water-colour for the study of oil-painting.'

With the introduction of a mechanical means by which the art of the calligrapher was produced, and his occupation in a great measure destroyed, there was a great stimulus given to the new and allied art of wood-engraving, as is evident in the magnificent productions of that past master in the art, Albert Dürer, and we find this new art intermarried with the ancient art of illumination in the numerous productions from the presses of Antwerp, Frankfort, and Nuremberg.

The Nuremberg Bible of Hans Lufft, with its splendid portrait of Augustus, Duke of Saxony, and its richly coloured miniatures, may be taken as a fair example of the work of such practised illuminators as George and Albert Glockendon, Hans Springinklee, and Jakob Elszner—all scholars of Dürer, and famous for their skill in this 'trade-work.'

The seven followers of Albert Dürer, known as 'the little masters,' were all engravers, draughtsmen, painters, and illuminators, and practised the method of colouring the painted wood-blocks. Their names are Albert Altdorfer, Hans Sebald Behaim or Beham, Barthel Beham, his brother, Heinrich Aldegrever, George Pencz, Jakob Binck, and Hans Brosamer. I must not forget to mention the large family of Nuremberg artists called Glockendon, or Glockenton: it was Nicolaus Glockendon, son of George, who illuminated a missal for the Cardinal Bishop of Mainz, Albert of Brandenburg. Nicolaus was the friend and fellow-pupil of Albert Dürer, and he had a family of eighteen sons and daughters. His twelve sons all followed some branch of the arts. The missal here

MINIATURES

mentioned, by which Nicolaus Glockendon is known, still exists in the public library at Aschaffenburg, and is considered a masterpiece of Nuremberg art.

It is now only necessary to concern ourselves with a few of the greatest artists who are authoritatively known to have executed miniatures, and who represent one or other of the three schools, Flemish, French, or Italian, and belong to this last period of the illuminated manuscript, from the invention of printing to the seventeenth century, when it may practically be said to have ceased to exist.

ITALIAN SCHOOL

To begin with the most flourishing school of this period. The Italian illuminators were no longer merely craftsmen, executing or directing the execution of innumerable manuscripts; they were artists sufficiently independent and esteemed to sign their own productions, and we find princes and prelates vying with each other in encouraging and patronising the art and the artists. The Italian churches were very rich at this time, and they employed the most famous miniaturists to illustrate their books of Psalms (*Livres de Chœur*). Many of these exist to-day, and those of Siena and of Florence are among the finest monuments of the century. To mention a few names in connection with them, Fra Lorenzo of Florence, Girolamo da Cremona, and Liberale da Verona of Siena, are all well known illuminators of these choir-books.

One of the most celebrated miniaturists at this time was Attavante. He was born at Florence in 1455 and died in 1520. His work is in the manner of the Italian cinquecento or Renaissance painters, making use of medallions, foliage, and cherubs as decorative motives. There are many valuable manuscripts by him preserved in various libraries. It is a proof of the renown of this

RENAISSANCE ORNAMENTATION

artist that Mathias Corvinus, King of Hungary, commissioned Attavante to execute several magnificent volumes. One of these, a 'Missale Romanum,' finished in 1487, is now in the Royal Library of Brussels. This manuscript is one of the most notable in Europe, and has been often described. Engravings from it are given in Eugène Müntz, *La Renaissance en Italie et en France*. There is nothing richer or more beautiful than the great masterpieces of the celebrated Attavante, and this particular manuscript is considered to be a typical example to which other less fully authenticated works could be compared.

In comparing the Italian fifteenth century school of miniaturists with its contemporaries, we see that it retained much more balance and symmetry in its style as compared with the flamboyant or picturesque manner prevalent in the Northern schools. The greater academic skill and knowledge of the Italian artists enabled them to introduce medallions and other forms into the open border without disturbing the general symmetry, and in the sixteenth century this work was carried to even greater elaboration.

We can get a good idea of this treatment in the Demosthenes in the British Museum, and there is a volume of fragments also in the Museum which is interesting as showing us the style of ornament practised in Italy at this period. They are the remnants of service-books made for various cardinals and popes of the time, and belonged formerly to the poet Rogers.

These fragments are all magnificently executed in rich harmonious colours with gold, and as they date from the fourteenth to the sixteenth centuries, they show us very completely the growth and development of Renaissance ornamentation. From these beautiful fragments it is easy to gain some idea of the profusion and elaboration of Italian choir-books. Folio 29, I think, represents the best example. Here we have richly designed arabesque borders in gold on a beautiful blue or red ground, with

MINIATURES

circular medallions let in, bearing the arms, devices, and motto of Pope Clement VII. They are attributed to Girolamo dai Libri.

Another series of fragments which are interesting as showing the different treatments of miniatures introduced into initial letters of a very large size, is also in the British Museum (Add. MS. 35,254). Fragments 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18, and 21 are the most worthy of study. Nos. 10 and 15 are attributed to Clovio, and they are certainly of his school. Nos. 11 and 12 are identical in treatment with folio 29, mentioned in the foregoing collection as by Girolamo, and No. 18 is interesting as containing a group of portraits. It is supposed to represent Henry VIII. with Cardinal Wolsey disputing with Charles V. before Pope Leo X. It is suggested that the roll the king holds is the bill, dated October 11, 1521, which gave him the title 'Defender of the Faith,' and that the open book in the hands of the Cardinal is Henry's book against Luther. But perhaps the most beautiful of these fragments is the last one, No. 21. It is a miniature of the Virgin praying, with an open book in her lap, and is one of three leaves from a Flemish book of hours. It measures $9\frac{1}{2}$ by $6\frac{3}{4}$ inches, and is painted in very beautiful cool greys and purple blue, with gold in the lights and an architectural background. The head of the Virgin is most delicate and refined in colour, drawing, and modelling, with reddish hair and a thin, white gauze veil.

This late perfection and maturity of the Italian school culminated in the work of Giulio Clovio, an artist who combined in his own work much of the refinement of Raphael with the force of Michael Angelo,—who had the receptive genius of absorbing the finest qualities in most of his predecessors and contemporaries, and who crowded his small pictures with the greatest amount of detail possible in the miniature, without ever really overstepping its limitations, though if we judge his work simply from the standpoint of book decoration, then we may truthfully say that its pictorial qualities

GIULIO CLOVIO

overreach its intention. He was a pupil of Giulio Romano and Girolamo dai Libri.

Whatever may be the opinion formed of this great artist, his importance in the history of miniature art and his position in relation to the Renaissance masters will justify me in devoting some considerable space to his life and work.

In giving a summary of the life and work of Giulio Clovio, I have taken full advantage of J. W. Bradley's careful and scholarly researches, as a book of reference. Before the publication of his *Life of Clovio* there was little known concerning him with any certainty, but Bradley has sifted the grain from the chaff, and at the same time accumulated such a wealth of reliable information that his biography leaves us nothing to wish for. The work of Clovio is of special interest to us because of the excellent portraits of his patrons, which he painted in medallions, as part of the decoration of the manuscript. These drawings are some of the earliest examples existing of real portrait miniatures in Italian illumination, painted with all the finish and detail of a skilled portrait painter.

Julio or Giulio Clovio was born in 1498 in Croatia, at Grizane, and he died in 1578. His baptismal name was Juraj or George, but his misfortunes obliging him to seek refuge in the monastery of San Ruffino at Mantua, he took the vows and assumed the name of Brother Giulio, out of gratitude to his old friend, Giulio Romano, who had previously become a member of this religious community, and whom he had not seen for many years.

It was after 1531 that Clovio worked so much in the service of Cardinals Marino Grimani and Alessandro Farnese the younger, grandson of Paul III., and was also employed by princes and many other persons of high rank. There are very few authentic examples of his work now remaining in private collections; these have risen to a quite fictitious value, which has been the

MINIATURES

cause of many works being wrongly attributed to him. It was Giulio Romano who urged Clovio to devote his entire energies to miniature painting, at a time when the latter was tempted to follow the example of his friend in painting frescoes. It was also Romano who taught the young miniaturist his own method of mixing and applying colours, making use of gum-water in place of the older vehicles as a medium for water-colours. To this extent Clovio may be said to have been the pupil of Giulio Romano. Giulio Pippi, called 'Il Romano,' was one of the ablest of that skilful band of artists whom Raphael chose to assist him in the decoration of the Vatican 'Loggie'—or open galleries of the Papal Palace in Rome.

Vasari relates that the first piece of miniature painting in which Clovio attempted colour was a Madonna from an engraving by Albert Dürer.

Soon after this, Clovio began to be well known as a painter of miniatures, and his renown spread so rapidly that within a very few years he received an invitation to visit the Hungarian Court, which at that time was one of the most splendid in Europe. It was in 1524 that Clovio accompanied the celebrated Alberto Pio da Carpi to Buda, the famous royal city of Hungary, where he worked for King Louis II., the successor of the great Matthias Corvinus who had been the most magnificent of book-collectors. In the world-famed Corvinus Library Clovio was able to study and revel in examples of all his greatest predecessors and contemporaries in book decoration. Unfortunately, in 1526 the city fell into the hands of the Turks, and with many others he was forced to fly for his life, and the priceless treasures of the Corvina were ruthlessly disposed of by the victors.

In the same year we see that Clovio returned to Rome, where he experienced still greater misfortunes. It was during this second visit to the capital that he came under the irresistible influence of Michael Angelo's

CLOVIO AND MICHAEL ANGELO

work, and employed himself in copying the paintings of the Sistine Chapel. At this time he was in the service of the well-known Cardinal Campeggio. In the following year Rome was stormed and sacked by the Germans and Spanish, and Clovio, after suffering much bodily and mental torment in prison, was carried off to the monastery of San Ruffino, at Mantua, with a broken leg. It was while here, as I have mentioned, that he met his friend Giulio Romano, and, probably in great depression caused by the misfortunes he had suffered, determined to devote himself to a religious life, and became a Scopetine monk. After a short stay at San Ruffino, Giulio visited the monastery of Candiana, near Padua. Here he found the celebrated Girolamo dai Libri of Verona busy at work for the brethren of the monastery, and it was probably through his persuasions that Clovio again applied himself to his profession, learning from Girolamo all that the veteran could teach him. Here he perfected his own characteristic excellences and surpassed the distinguished Veronese in design and drawing. It was not long before a former patron, Cardinal Marino Grimani, discovering his hiding-place, insisted on his return to Rome, and finally, overcoming all arguments in respect to his vows, promised to obtain all needful dispensation from the Pope himself, with the result that in 1531 Clovio became an inmate of the Grimani Palace at Perugia. He remained in the service of Cardinal Grimani for about nine years, and in 1540 he transferred his talents to the service of the Cardinal Farnese at Rome, the grandson of the Pope. This change introduced him to the best artists and literary society of the time, and he soon gained the rare distinction of knowing Michael Angelo personally. Bradley says: 'The improvement in the work he produced at this time over the Grimani Commentaries is manifest, and we see at once the effect of the renewed influence of the great Florentine. In the beautiful volumes executed for Cardinal Farnese, Clovio showed that he had profited by his many op-

MINIATURES

portunities, combining in them a wealth of symbolism and classic elegance of form with the most skilful and effective design and perfection of colouring.'

We next find the celebrated miniaturist in Parma, working for the Duchess of Parma, sister to Philip II. About this time he suffered the unexpected calamity of a disease in his left eye which threatened to destroy his sight, but fortunately, in January 1558, an operation proved successful. Clovio then went to Correggio to restore his health, but in the year 1561 he returned once more to Rome, still very feeble. He was now sixty-three years old, and until his death in 1578 his infirmities prevented him from working to any extent, though we know that he painted a portrait of the Duke of Parma, apparently from the figure of the Duke which he had preserved in a little book.

Some of Clovio's earliest characteristics and principles of colouring were probably gained at the time of his first stay in Rome, when he had the opportunity of seeing the copies made by Raphael and his assistants from the newly discovered paintings in the Baths of Titus, even if he did not indeed work with the rest among the actual frescoes. The peculiarity of the colouring of those ancient frescoes, which consists in the introduction of the local colour in the folds of the draperies and shadow portions of the figure, and an absence of almost all colour from the lights, was imitated much by Clovio in his miniatures, and is so strongly characteristic of his work that miniatures have been attributed to him on the strength of its existence alone. In judging the work of this great master 'in little,' we must always remember that he was essentially an adept at imitating the qualities of those painters whom he chose to copy. It may therefore be said that he had more than one style, or that his style was really the reflection of the work from which he drew his ideas.

It is shown by Pacheco, who was the master and father-in-law of Velasquez, and a celebrated writer on

CLOVIO'S METHODS

art, in his elaborate treatise on painting, that there are two quite different styles in illumination. They differ in the manner of painting the flesh-tints and draperies. 'The former makes use of the tint of the vellum itself for the lights, and with middle tints touches in the shading or modelling sweetly, deepening and strengthening by means of fine points until the artist has obtained the requisite force.' Such is the method followed by Clovio and his imitators. The second method is likened to ancient tempera, 'where the "carnations" are laid in their natural colours, and their tones varied as is done in "good oil-painting," covering the vellum, although with colours possessing but little body and strengthened by means of washes or layers of colour.' Giulio Clovio is one of the several artists to whom credit is given for having invented the stippling method of work. In any case, he probably carried it to greater perfection than any previous painter, and generally worked in this manner, though the solid gouache method was sometimes used by him. In comparing the work of Clovio with that of his contemporaries, we have to exclude the work of the Netherlandish painters and also of the Nuremberg school. The methods of the latter schools were absolutely different, lacking much of the grace and fertility of invention, no doubt, but possessing instead a vigour and originality of style which had always been a characteristic of the more Northern schools.

A small manuscript volume is to be seen in the British Museum, which is authoritatively given as painted by Giulio Clovio. It is called 'Beatissime Virginis Marie Officium' (Add. MS. 20,927), preceded by a calendar and followed by the 'Septem Psalmi Penitentiales,' 'Officium Mortuorum and Officium Sancte Crucis,' and it was painted about the year 1540 for Cardinal Grimani, whose arms are inserted in the border of the first title-page. The frontispiece consists of a miniature, 3 inches by $1\frac{1}{2}$, of the Annunciation, surrounded by a rich Renaissance border of cherubs, scrolls, masks, and medallions on a

MINIATURES

gold ground. The miniature is quite classic in its rendering, delicate in colour, drawing, and manipulation, and fine in its arrangement of draperies. The figure of the angel is vigorous in action, that of the Virgin, though delicately drawn and coloured, lacks dignity and reserve, the attitude being posed and artificial. There are besides three other full-page miniatures and illuminations, one before each of the offices and Psalms with a corresponding title-page. In the miniatures we have much technical skill, but there is religious sentiment without religious feeling—classic drawing without its constructive force—careful and accurate manipulation without quality or inspiration. The borders are all more or less overburdened with their profuse and ornate decoration, though in detail there is no denying they show the hand of a master. I cannot but feel in looking at this work that marvellous though it is in its ambitious attempt at rivaling the great painters of the Renaissance, it would have achieved more had it attempted less, and been content with a broader method of handling.

But to see the finest work of Giulio Clovio, and to appreciate it to the full, notwithstanding all its mannerisms and affectations, we must look at the example which is in the possession of the Soane Museum.

It is the 'Commentary of Cardinal Marino Grimani on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans,' written in golden letters. It contains a full-page illumination measuring 13 inches by 9, at the commencement of the book; the central picture, which is $8\frac{1}{2}$ inches by $6\frac{1}{2}$, represents the conversion of St. Paul. Here we see a masterpiece of exquisite finish and manipulation, the drawing is remarkable in its classic appreciation of form, and the modelling is obtained by such finesse and delicacy of handling, that it cannot for a moment be considered as looking laboured; at the same time the colour is cold and hard, the composition is involved, and the action of the figures extravagant and theatrical. What inspiration it possesses is obtained by a scholarly adaptation of greater masters.



PORTRAIT FROM THE GENEALOGICAL TREE SHOWING THE ALLIANCES
 BETWEEN THE ROYAL HOUSES OF SPAIN AND PORTUGAL

BY SIMON DENNINCK

CARDINAL MARINO GRIMANI

BY GIULIO CLOVIO

MINIATURE OF CARDINAL GRIMANI

The border is crowded with ornate motives of nude figures, draperies, armour, and medallions. In the centre of the lower border, and in the left-hand border, are two small miniatures. The larger one is a vigorous composition of the martyrdom of St. Stephen, and here the subject lends itself to the violence of action and gesture which seems so characteristic of this artist. The skilful elaboration of the drawing in the small circular picture must be seen to be realised. Each unit in the complex border is a perfect example of miniature painting, but together they form a framework to the central picture which is tiresome and even aggressive. On the opposite page we have the text surrounded by borders of the same style, but here they stand on their own merits, and do not clash with the subject-matter of the page. In the right-hand border there is a beautiful and lifelike portrait of the Cardinal, in an oval of $1\frac{3}{4}$ inches (Plate I.). This miniature seems to me an all-sufficient proof of Clovio's skill in portraiture. The dignity and simplicity of colour, the breadth of light and tone, enables it to stand out of its overcrowded surroundings in a conspicuous manner. In the lower border there are two magnificent dragons holding a medallion miniature of the arms of the Grimani family. The miniatures in this manuscript may fully justify those who place Clovio above all other miniature painters of the illuminated manuscript, but I am myself inclined towards a more individual and less classic and academic inspiration.

One of the most important rivals to Clovio's claim to excellence is his master Girolamo dai Libri, who was born in 1474 and died in 1555. Girolamo was a skilful artist but lacked his pupil's versatility; his work is notable, however, for great delicacy and truth. He excelled not only in ornament and figures, but also in flowers, and imitated cameos and other jewels with great success.

Girolamo worked in the solid tempera method, and signed examples of his work are very rare, though

MINIATURES

numerous collections claim to have them, but very few can show any adequate attestation. The 'Hours' in the Soane collection, and examples in the Douce collection in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, are attributed with confidence to his hand.

The work which, according to Vasari, most advanced Girolamo's reputation, was the miniature of the Terrestrial Paradise, with the expulsion of Adam and Eve, painted for the Prior of San Giorgio in Verona.

Francisco de Holanda, another contemporary, was seventeen years younger than Clovio, and was a native of Lisbon. He went twice to Rome and became familiar with many of the great men of the day, and among them Giulio Clovio. He was a good draughtsman, an architect, and a skilful miniature painter. He claimed to be able to work pretty nearly as well as Clovio himself, and declared that his father invented the method which Clovio followed.

George Hoefnagel, also a disciple, was born in Antwerp in 1545 and died in Vienna, 1600. He travelled a good deal, and in the year 1577, in company with Abraham Oertal, happened to visit Rome, when Clovio was quite old and nearly worn out, and he was so much attracted by the latter's work that he resolved to devote himself to the same style. Without difficulty he acquired similar delicacy and finish, but he never attained Clovio's power of drawing or colouring.

Another miniaturist, sometimes compared with Clovio, is Benedetto Bordone of Padua. Two examples of his work are in the British Museum (Add. MSS. 15,813, 15,815) and some writers have ranked him with Clovio, but from these examples this is setting him too high. Mention also may be made of Federigo Broccio, the son of a sculptor and born at Urbino in 1528, where he studied under Battisto Franco. After some years of practice his fame increased and he was invited to Rome by Pius IV., and painted in the Vatican in company with Federigo Zuccherò. He took Correggio as his great model, and

JEAN BOURDICHON

though his draughtsmanship is good, his colouring is weak. He died at his native place, Urbino, in 1612.

FRENCH SCHOOL

In considering the French school of miniature painters of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries as a whole, we are forced to the conclusion that Fouquet is far and away its greatest exponent; few, if any, of his contemporaries or successors can be said to have equalled him. As has already been observed, his manner and methods of work approached very closely to the Netherlandish school, but many of his motives and qualities show considerable Italian influence.

Later in the fifteenth, and during the sixteenth, century, French miniatures come strongly under Italian influence: the type of countenance is more idealised and loses something of the naïve simplicity which had always been one of the dominant qualities of Flemish and French art. However, the French school possessed two or three worthy followers of Fouquet in Jean Bourdichon, Jean Perréal, Geoffrey Tory, and others.

Jean Bourdichon, like his illustrious contemporary, was a native of Tours. He was born in the year 1457 and died about 1521. He was appointed court painter and valet-de-chambre successively to Louis XI., Charles VIII., and Louis XII. This position seems to have entailed a most extraordinary number and variety of employments and commissions, from the painting of armorials for the knights of the Order of St. Michael, to the making of armour and equipages for war, and the designing of dresses for tournaments, weddings, funerals, and other ceremonies; which fact makes it easy to see how such miniaturists as Fouquet, Bourdichon, and later Perréal, were so accomplished in the exquisite decorations of armour in their miniatures. Added to this, they were called upon to fulfil the duties of king's messenger or private envoy.

MINIATURES

Some writers think that the celebrated volume, the 'Hours of Anne of Bretagne,' in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, was partially produced by Bourdichon, and give him credit for the marvellous marginal adornments of fruits, flowers, and plants, which constitute a veritable herbarium, with the name of every plant inscribed beneath.

This manuscript contains fifty-one large paintings in the best style. One of the most beautiful is the painting at the commencement of the volume, representing the queen kneeling, with three saints, Anne, Ursula, and Helen. Every picture of large dimensions is surrounded by a broad line of gold enframing it, without any ornamentation. Bradley, in commenting on this manuscript and a small book of hours for Anne of Bretagne, says: 'The miniatures in the small book and also in the "Great Hours" were probably done by Bourdichon, whose skill is displayed most in figures and portraiture.' He says at the same time, that 'a miniaturist named Jean Poyet of Tours executed the floral and fruit borders,'—these are said to have been Poyet's special forte. To quote further: 'The paintings of the "Great Hours" are clearly the work of two French artists, one working in the manner of the Flemish school, the other in that of Tours. Both, however, are influenced more by the style of Fouquet than by that of Beauneveu or Marmion.'

Another French miniaturist of this period, whose name I have mentioned, is Jean Perréal. He was styled painter and valet-de-chambre to the king. The title of valet-de-chambre under the ancient kings of France was a possession of considerable value; it conferred nobility and the title of esquire, and was transmissible with its privileges by will or heirship. Artists and literary men of note were frequently enrolled as a reward or mark of favour. Jan Van Eyck held this position under Philip of Burgundy, and similarly the court painters under Charles v. and his successors. Perréal was employed to provide the funeral paraphernalia on the death of

JEAN PERRÉAL AND GEOFFREY TORY

Louis XII., as he had already done on the death of Anne of Bretagne, and his various occupations were as numerous as was the case with most of those who enjoyed a similar rank.

Lady Dilke is inclined to assign to Perréal the execution of the masterly miniatures in the Oglethorpe Bible at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. These miniatures are certainly of the school of Tours rather than of Paris, though not so markedly as to exclude Northern influence altogether, and they display that minute facility in ornamental details in the armour, etc., which is so common an accomplishment with artists like Perréal, Bourdichon, and the costume designers generally.

Of Geoffrey Tory, born at Bourges in 1485, Didot says: 'He appears to have been, like other great men of his epoch, an universal genius; he was versed in Greek, Latin, and even Hebrew literature.' There is every authority for supposing that Tory was a printer, engraver, designer, and painter, and it appears certain that he was an able miniaturist. Didot, the elder, once possessed a manuscript of Diodorus Siculus, which had been presented to the king by Tory, and is justly considered to have been transcribed and ornamented by his own hand. The admirable painting which serves as a frontispiece, representing Francis I. in the midst of his courtiers, is worthy to rank with the work of Perréal and Jean Fouquet. Bernard suggests that the Godefroy who painted the Commentaries of Cæsar and the Triumphs of Petrarch was Geoffrey Tory; but the arguments against this being so are, firstly, the masterly skill and experienced touch shown in the Cæsar drawings, which appear too far advanced for such a beginner as Tory then was; and secondly, the birthplace of the artist seems to have been Besançon, not Bourges, judging from the more than ordinary care bestowed on the drawing of that city in the Cæsar, with the date 1519.

Tory studied under Jean Perréal, and visited Rome and Bologna. He took great interest in everything con-

MINIATURES

nected with typography, and his reputation depends principally on this connection. He has been styled the first royal printer, the king having bestowed on him the title of *imprimeur du Roy*.

'The Bedford Missal' (Add. MS. 18,850) in the British Museum is a most sumptuously decorated and illuminated volume of French workmanship, belonging to the early fifteenth century, and is quite perfect as an example of the best style. It contains two hundred and ninety illuminated pages, and every page has a rich border of delicately penned scroll-work of ivy leaves and flowers, the leaves sparkling with burnished gold. Within these borders there are set circular miniatures of $1\frac{1}{4}$ inches, two on each page, painted in pure colours, and quaint in their minute decorative design—like mosaic set in a filigree of gold and jewels. There are also four full-page miniatures at the commencement of the volume, very quaintly designed, representing the story of Adam and Eve and the Fall, the building of the Ark, and the animals leaving the Ark—the Ark in these last two pictures being represented as a wooden shanty or house with a pointed roof, and the fourth is the building of the Tower of Babel. Besides these, the volume contains many full-page illuminations with decorative miniatures, in richly ornamented borders enclosing small medallions of figure subjects, and the only objection which can be taken is that the colour scheme in these latter pages is a little crude. This volume is of especial interest, as it contains the only known portrait of the Duke of Bedford. When we remember that every one of its many pages is an almost perfect example of the calligrapher's and illuminator's skill, the whole volume represents a labour of love, which is indeed an eloquent tribute to the artists and to the writers. We may, in all justice, consider that this volume represents the high-water mark of their joint attainment in the art of decorating and illuminating manuscripts. The artists may later attain greater technical precision in drawing

GODEFROY

and more realistic expression, but it is usually at the expense of those beautiful decorative qualities which go to the making of perfect unity on the page.

In the French school of miniature painting of the sixteenth century, we can note the struggle between the old French art and the Italian style recently introduced. In some manuscripts the two styles are mingled, but with rare exceptions the productions of the decadent French school are more curious than beautiful.

We must, however, except the masterpieces of Godefroy, whom some writers, as I have said, have identified without proof as the celebrated Geoffrey Tory. There exist four small volumes admirably illustrated, of which the paintings, signed Godefroy or G. or Godefridus Batavus, are dated 1519 and 1520. Three are dialogues between François I. and Cæsar on the Conquest of the Gauls, and are entitled 'Commentaires de Cesar,' and the fourth 'Triomphes de Petrarque.' The three volumes are at the Bibliothèque Nationale, at the British Museum, and Chantilly, and the fourth is at the Arsenal Museum, Paris.

Godefroy was probably a native of Artois or Flanders. His work is remarkable for skilful manipulation, fertility of invention, and an excellent faculty for portraiture. The proportions of his figures show the strong influence of the new school being formed at Fontainebleau by the artists imported from Italy.

The three manuscripts mentioned above contain grisailles with touches of colour, medallions imitated from the antique, portraits of various personages at the court of François I., and engines of war. The framing is Italian in style, but in the general execution and in the drawing they are characteristic of the French school in the style of Geoffrey Tory.

There is really nothing known of the life of Godefridus Batavus, who, although a foreigner, knew so well how to adopt the French manner. At the time he was working we must remember that a colony of Italian artists was residing in France, at the head of whom I may

MINIATURES

mention Leonardo da Vinci and Andrea del Sarto; therefore Godefroy may be considered the product of this Italian influence acting on the French school.

The 'Commentaries of Cæsar,' in the British Museum (Harl. 6205), is a manuscript of a panel shape in single columns on a page of $9\frac{1}{2}$ by $4\frac{3}{4}$ inches. The grisaille miniatures are usually about $3\frac{1}{4}$ by $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches, enclosed in a simple gold band. They represent masterly compositions of warriors taking part in various battles. As may be gathered from the size of the miniatures, the figures are most minute, yet they are full of natural action and in complete armour, and all the warlike paraphernalia is most marvellously touched in. So minute is the workmanship that the naked eye cannot discover the actual method of technique, but with a powerful magnifying glass we see that the drawing is done with an extremely fine free pen-line on an even grey ground, the high lights being delicately painted in with white. Richness and colour are given to the miniatures by a clever use of gold on the armour, or neutral tints of blue in the sky or water of the landscape backgrounds. These miniatures are all dated 1519, and mostly signed with the initial G. The battle-piece on page 35 is a *tour de force* in its largeness of treatment and extreme minuteness of finish, and under the magnifying glass it seems to gain in elaboration and dexterity.

There are two very fine circular cameo portraits at the commencement of the book representing François I. and Cæsar. The first is a three-quarter face and most subtle in modelling, and the other a profile; both are relieved against a background of dark blue, with the initial letters in gold—F. M. and J. C. respectively.

There are two other French miniaturists of this period, Jacques Plastel, probably of Amiens, and Jean Pinchon. Both worked on a large folio manuscript containing forty-eight full-page miniatures which is now in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris. It is principally interesting to us as containing a number of portraits of notables.

THE MINIATURE PAINTERS OF BRUGES

As an example of the prevailing custom of painting portraits in the illuminated books, the celebrated 'Book of Hours' of Catherine de Medicis now at the Louvre should be instanced. This volume contains fifty-eight portraits in miniature of princes and princesses of the Royal house or that of Lorraine. All these portraits are not equally good, but some are admirably lifelike—for instance those of Catherine de Medicis as Saint Clare, François I., and the children of this prince.

FLEMISH SCHOOL

The Flemish school of the fifteenth century was in a very flourishing state, and from the middle of the century until its close it brought miniature painting to rare technical perfection and elaboration—in fact the miniatures of the latter half of the century are quite remarkable in their minute imitative realism.

The object of the artists seems to have been to vie with nature herself, and in the borders we see flowers, insects, birds, and even jewels, amongst the interstices of the foliage, each with its projecting shadow most accurately depicted, until the surface of the vellum page looks like a horticultural museum. The result, though very wonderful, is a parody of decoration.

During the latter part of the fifteenth century, enormous numbers of illuminated manuscripts were produced in Flanders, especially at Bruges. The miniatures often show great beauty, and the borders many novelties of treatment. There is no doubt that many of the greatest artists of the century engaged occasionally in this work. The Van Eycks, Memling, Lucas van Leyden, Mabuse, have all been credited with producing illuminations, and many others are known to have done so. The probability of the Van Eycks and Memling having illuminated, I have already discussed. Their art was positively very closely allied to that of the miniaturists, as may be seen in the manner of their technique, and we, at any rate, know

MINIATURES

that they could paint in oil on a miniature scale with all the elaboration and delicate finish of the manuscript illumination. Among the most remarkable productions of Memling are the paintings upon the reliquary of St. Ursula. It is of Gothic design and embellished on every side with miniature pictures in oil. The beauty of the colouring, drawing, and composition in all of these pictures is undeniable, and their delicacy of finish and breadth of handling are worthy alike of his own art and the art of the most accomplished miniaturist.

It is interesting to mention here that Mr. Weale, who is an authority on Netherlandish art, is strongly of the opinion, I am told, that Memling executed a very fine miniature of Christ in a 'Book of Hours' which is in the possession of the Soane Museum. It is certainly a very beautiful example of Flemish miniature work, and measures 5 inches by 3. The head is very well drawn and painted, and the draperies and hands are carefully and dexterously rendered. The Saviour is represented holding a crystal orb surmounted by a cross, with two fingers of the right hand uplifted, the figure relieving against a background of solid gold (Plate II.). The borders are of the realistic style already commented on as typical of this period. Mr. Weale is also of the opinion that the other truly excellent miniatures in the volume are more than probably by Gerard David. Some of these are masterly in composition, drawing, and effect, and are painted in low tones of rich colour. The draperies in all the miniatures are quite exceptional in their arrangement and careful painting, most worthily representing the best Flemish art.

I have seen a small panel picture by Van Eyck, which measures about $7\frac{1}{2}$ by $4\frac{1}{4}$ inches. It represents the Holy Virgin and Child near a fountain. Mary, who is clothed in an ample mantle, her hair bound with a light band, ornamented with fine pearls, is carrying the child Jesus. He is holding in His left



MANUSCRIPT MINIATURE FROM "BOOK OF HOURS," IN THE SOANE MUSEUM

ATTRIBUTED TO HANS MEMLING

Flemish, late Fifteenth Century

MINIATURE OF PHILIP THE GOOD

hand a chaplet of coral, and caresses His mother with His right. To the right is a brass fountain with four jets. The feet of the Virgin rest on the lower part of a 'cloth of honour' which two angels hold extended behind her. On each side of the drapery there is a stone bench covered with grass and flowering plants. This picture is now in the museum at Antwerp. The beautiful quality of the blue mantle and the exquisite finish of every detail of the picture quite justify one in considering it in every sense a miniature.

An excellent example of a portrait miniature, which foreshadows the qualities and treatment attained by the Holbein school at the commencement of the following century, can be seen in a manuscript 'Book of the Order of the Fleece' in the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge. It is a square miniature ($4\frac{1}{2}$ by 6 inches), and represents a lifelike portrait of Philip the Good, half-length, three-quarter face turned to the left, in a broad black head-dress and black gown with fur collar, wearing round his neck the gold chain of the Order of the Golden Fleece, and holding in his hands a small roll of parchment. This miniature, and the four shields which surround it, date from about 1480. It is a remarkable and interesting example of early Flemish portraiture in miniature: the face is full of character and strong in drawing; the flesh-tints are simple and pale with a touch of bright red on the lips. The dark blue background, the black costume, and the touch of gold in the chain, combine to make a dignified and simple scheme of colour which is quite worthy of much later work. I give an illustration of this excellent portrait miniature (*Frontispiece*). Compared with the portraits executed by the Italian Clovio, of a slightly later date, it is somewhat archaic in its method of work, but it shows very conclusively that the Flemish school at this time was strong in its realisation of individual character, if a little crude in its manner of expression.

It has been the fashion to call the numerous artists

MINIATURES

of this period, who were natives of the Low Countries, and who practised their profession at one or other of the principal towns in Flanders, 'the early Flemish painters.' It is, however, a matter of fact, as Mr. W. H. J. Weale points out in his excellent monograph on Gerard David, that all the great painters of the fifteenth century came from that part of the Low Countries to the east of the river Scheldt; and the greatest of all came from Brabant, Holland, Guelders, and the banks of the Maas or Meuse, while Flanders, properly so called, hardly produced any artist of note. So we see that the older title of 'Netherlandish,' formerly in use, was far more correct.

The miniaturists and painters who settled in Flanders were recognised masters of their art, and were attracted to Bruges and Ghent because of the great prosperity of these towns. Works of art found a ready sale here on account of the numbers of wealthy merchants and strangers who gathered at the annual fairs.

It was to Bruges that Jan Van Eyck, Hans Memling, and Gerard David were attracted.

Of this last-named artist there is no doubt whatever that he practised miniature painting. Gerard David was born at Oudewater, in Holland, about 1450, and died in 1523. He probably learned his art at Haarlem, but he came to Bruges in 1483, where he settled, acquiring the right of citizenship, and taking David for his surname. That he was already an accomplished painter is proved by his having been admitted at once into the Guild of St. Luke as a master painter. His early works are like those of Dierick or Thierry Bouts, who was also a student of Haarlem, which leaves little doubt that his art was learned in Holland. In his later paintings we may see the influence of Hans Memling. As a member of the Guild of Illuminators, he had a right to work on miniatures for books.

There are two authentic works by David in miniature: 'The Preaching of St. John the Baptist' and 'The Baptism of Christ.' They were formerly kept in the

GERARD DAVID

Abbey of Dunes, but are now in the museum of the Academy at Bruges. In the first miniature St. John stands upon a hillock with his left hand upraised, as he addresses a group of persons seated around him. In the background the figure of Christ may be seen walking towards a wood. In the second miniature St. John kneels on one knee on the banks of a river, and is in the act of pouring water from his hand on the head of Christ, who is standing in the stream, and, above, the Heavenly Father is represented blessing His Son.

Gerard David stood at the head of the great school of miniature painters which flourished at Bruges, and for more than a quarter of a century he was the leading artist of that town.

There is positive evidence, as Mr. Weale suggests, in the landscape backgrounds of all the great Netherlandish masters, that they retained a love for the hilly country beyond the Scheldt, and cared little for the flat country of Flanders. The same writer makes it clear that the excellent manuscripts produced at this period were the work of professional calligraphers, natives of various countries, who were constantly engaged in writing missals, breviaries, and books of hours for exportation, and that the fine vellum of which the books were composed was a Netherlandish speciality.

Gerard David, about the year 1497, married Cornelia, daughter of Jakob Cnoop the younger, of Middelburg, dean of the Goldsmiths' Guild at Bruges.

Cornelia was also an accomplished miniaturist, and we have three very good examples of her work. They are now in the possession of Mr. Henry Willett of Brighton, and they take the form of a triptych. In the central panel the Virgin Mary is seen full-face, holding in her arms the Infant Saviour. The right-hand panel is a nearly full-length figure of St. Katherine, standing in a meadow, and on the left is the figure of St. Barbara. The heads and the hands in all the miniatures are beautifully drawn and modelled. It

MINIATURES

seems fairly certain that the figures of Gerard David served as models for the figures of the two saints in Cornelia's work, and indeed for many other miniatures executed at Bruges, which appear to have been copied from David's designs.

The only known pupil of Gerard David is Adrian, who became a citizen of Bruges in 1510, and was admitted as a master-painter into the Guild of St. Luke and St. Eligius, being a member of the council of his craft. He is said to have excelled as a portrait painter.

The following artists were all members of one or other of the Guilds as miniaturists about this time working at Bruges, and were also master-painters who produced original works on a larger scale:—Didier de la Rivière, Fabian de Manière, William Wallinc, Adriaen de Raet, a pupil of William Vrelant, miniaturist; Adriaen Fabiaen, and Simon Bynnynek or Benninc. This Simon Benninck—to spell his name in yet another way—was called Simon of Bruges. He was born at Antwerp and lived there at the beginning of the sixteenth century, but finally fixed his residence at Bruges in 1518. He had five children, of whom the eldest was Levina, Lievine, or Livinia, married to George Teerlinck, a townsman of Blankenburgh. I shall mention her again later. Simon Benninck was a graceful colourist, and excelled in painting landscape as well as portraits. His only authenticated works are a miniature of the Crucifixion in a missal, and the Genealogy of the Royal House of Portugal, eleven sheets of which are preserved in the British Museum (Add. MS. 12,531).

This great work, begun in 1530 by order of the Infante Don Fernando, remained unfinished at that prince's death in 1534. It consists of eleven leaves of vellum, enriched with a series of illuminations measuring 21 by $14\frac{1}{2}$ inches; they represent varying treatments of a genealogical tree on which stand, or are intertwined, the royal portraits. These portraits are undoubtedly very interest-

MANUSCRIPT MINIATURE PORTRAITS

ing specimens of portrait miniature, and some of the best, if cut away from their pretentious and inharmonious surroundings, would hold their own with many of the examples of sixteenth-century portrait painters. In my opinion, the decorative portion of the designs is quite out of balance—too solid in relief and too spotty and crude in colour. The first two leaves do not interest us except for the armorial bearings of Portugal, which are richly emblazoned on the title-page. The portraits on leaves four, five, and six are all excellently studied paintings, and some of the women's heads are charming specimens of miniature work, recalling the manner of Holbein. They are excellent in colour, drawing, and modelling, and are painted without shadows in transparent colour, delicately stippled, and in their character are undeniably Flemish (Plates I. and III.). But, as I have said, the beautiful work in the heads, armour, and costumes is lost in a maze of trivialities which quite usurp the position of importance. Unfortunately, some of the later leaves are damaged and unfinished, and the last one has not been carried further than the first sketching in with pen and ink. This is, however, interesting, as showing the great care with which the artist drew and planned out the whole page before colouring, giving even the shadows and relief of every detail with a delicately etched pen-stroke. I am inclined to believe from this drawing that the decorative part of these illuminations must have been finished by another hand, which would account for the overdue importance given to it, and which is not evident in the pen drawing just mentioned.

There are also round the borders of these pages minutely finished miniatures representing various historical incidents in connection with the history of the two houses. They are careful and good examples of their style, but wholly out of harmony with the rest of the designs.

Gerard Horenbout was a painter and illuminator of

MINIATURES

Ghent, where he was born in 1498, and died sometime after 1550. His name is itself a stumbling-block, and is spelt in numberless different ways.

Horenbout executed several important works for Margaret of Austria, one of them being a portrait of King Christian of Denmark, her nephew.

We have in the British Museum some leaves and borders taken from a book of 'Hours of the Blessed Virgin' (Add. MS. 24,098), which have been painted by Flemish artists, and it is conjectured that many of the miniatures were from the hand of 'Gerhard Hoornback'—which is another spelling of the same name. Whether this is so or not, the miniatures, of which there are twenty-one, are such admirable examples of the Netherlandish school, that we cannot injure any artist's reputation by attributing them to him. Eight of the miniatures have a religious motive, with Gothic borders and small panel subjects in the lower margin. Their workmanship is beautiful, and their treatment, though full of truth and realism, is decorative in its purpose. This is accomplished by a skilful massing of the figures and a breadth of tone and colour, without the introduction of needless and petty shadows. The heads of the small figures, some of which are not more than two-eighths of an inch, are full of character and expression, many being absolute masterpieces of delicate drawing, modelling, and tone. The architectural backgrounds also are beautiful and sufficient, and the quality of colour throughout is soft yet rich. The remaining thirteen miniatures are more realistic both in subject and rendering, though not less skilful in their delicate, subtle appreciation of character, tone, and colour. In these, which represent the illustrations of the calendar, we see the life of the people, given with much art and absolute accuracy in every detail, whether it be architecture, landscape, costume, implements, sports, or agricultural pursuits; and we have delightful pictures of Bruges and its surroundings in the backgrounds.



PORTRAITS FROM THE GENEALOGICAL TREE SHOWING THE ALLIANCES
 BETWEEN THE ROYAL HOUSES OF SPAIN AND PORTUGAL

BY SIMON BENNINGK
 Early Sixteenth Century

GRIMANI BREVIARY

Susanna Horenbout was the daughter of Gerard, and was also a skilful miniaturist. She was mentioned by Albert Dürer in his *Tour in the Low Countries*. She was with her father at Antwerp when Dürer happened to be there, and bought of her, for a florin, a miniature of Christ, and he says, 'It seems a miracle that a child could do so well.' She is supposed to have married the treasurer of Henry VIII., and is credited with having gained a brilliant reputation at the court of this king.

An interesting specimen of the Flemish school of the period is the 'Chronicles of England' in the British Museum (Roy. MS. 14 E. iv.), executed for Edward IV. at Bruges about 1480, the chief frontispiece of which, in the opinion of Dr. Waagen, was drawn by Van Eyck, but this is, I think, hardly warranted by its merits. That the miniatures are by Flemish artists is quite evident from the type of head, and the solid and somewhat brown manner of painting the flesh. The costumes and armour are painted with care and knowledge, and the minute designs executed in gold on some of the robes are quite remarkable.

Authorities consider that the most celebrated specimen of Flemish work is the manuscript known as the Grimani Breviary, preserved in St. Mark's, Venice. This is a quarto volume bound in crimson velvet, with a gold border elaborately chased, enclosing a medallion of Cardinal Grimani. The accounts of this breviary nearly always credit Memling with having produced many of the one hundred and ten drawings which it contains, assisted by his scholars, Gerard of Ghent and Lievin of Antwerp; but the beauty of the work in this unrivalled manuscript has led, at one time or another, to the names of almost every Netherlandish artist of repute being associated with it, and the question of identification is exceedingly difficult, and we can only hope that the account of its production, which may still be in existence, will one day be forthcoming. Amongst others, Mabuse, Levina Teerlinck and her father, Simon Benninck, have

MINIATURES

all been credited with a share in the work. This wonderful breviary was one of the treasures in the library of Cardinal Domenico Grimani, the first patron of the youthful Clovio. It may be interesting to add that a very beautiful facsimile edition of this breviary is now in course of publication.

In the British Museum is another manuscript, a 'Book of Hours' (Add. MS. 18,855), which is an object-lesson in the contrast which existed late in the fifteenth century between the work of the Flemish and French miniaturists. This volume contains four miniatures inserted at the end, which are by a Flemish artist; they have nothing to do with the subject of the book, but are delightful little miniature pictures, 4 inches by 6, representing agricultural subjects and sport. The architecture and the landscape are most minute and delicate in elaboration, and at the same time the tone values of every little detail are so truthfully rendered that the general effect is broad and sensitive. The figures, which are small, some being not more than a quarter of an inch in height, are full of realistic character, expression, and action, and are skilfully used to introduce a warm note of colour in an otherwise cool scheme of green, greys, and blues. The delicate drawing of the trees, especially in the boar-hunt, speaks to a loving study of nature, as also does the beautiful rendering of the atmospheric perspective. These miniatures, which are undoubtedly magnificent examples of the art which was prevalent in the Netherlands, can hardly be looked upon as illuminations; they are too pictorial, too real, and lack the necessary conventions which mark the best examples of the illuminator's work.

The French miniatures in the body of the book are quite unsatisfactory, either from the decorator's or painter's point of view: they are coarse in handling, and the figure-drawing is feeble. The landscape backgrounds, which are treated somewhat conventionally, are poor in colour and form; and the panel decorations are

GERMAN, PORTUGUESE, AND SPANISH

set in pretentious Renaissance architectural frames, in gold and colours. The realistic borders, on the other hand, are evidently Flemish work, and represent almost every known flower, thrown with decorative skill on a gold ground, with insects disporting themselves in their natural environment. Certainly, as perfect botanical studies, nothing could excel them.

In the German, Portuguese, and Spanish illuminations we can distinguish so little individualistic style that we may class them broadly with other known schools. It seems evident that foreign artists were almost exclusively employed, or at any rate artists who had been trained in one of the foreign centres of artistic activity. The art of the Renaissance throughout Europe was the combined product of the ideas and motives of the Italians in the South, and the Netherlands and French in the Northwest. It was the happy amalgamation of selective realism and classic symbolism which gave us the greatest works of the greatest masters of the Renaissance, whatever country they belonged to.

I have already made mention of the miniatures illustrating the alliances of the two Royal Houses of Spain and Portugal, which were executed by a Flemish artist; and I may here refer to another manuscript which was produced late in the fifteenth century and is now in the British Museum, and which is considered to be quite one of the finest manuscripts of the Netherlandish school. It is called the Breviary of Isabella of Castile, wife of Ferdinand II. The miniatures, surrounded by heraldic emblazonments and borders of scrolls and flowers, on gold or coloured ground, have undoubtedly been executed by Flemish artists. One of these, the celebrated miniature of St. Barbara, is deservedly considered one of the most perfect little pictures now existing. The volume contains over five hundred illuminated and illustrated pages, and is curious in its diversity of treatment, both of the miniatures and the borders. Here we have in juxtaposition the most realistic and, I am in-

MINIATURES

clined to say, trivial renderings, with the most decorative arabesque foliage; some of the later examples being excellent in design, colour, and execution. Taking the volume as a whole, though indeed containing a wealth of careful work, I do not think it presents sufficient unity of purpose, but may be viewed rather as a sumptuous series of experiments in page decoration.

CHAPTER III

HOLBEIN AND HIS LESSER CONTEMPORARIES—THEIR RELATION TO, AND INFLUENCE ON, THE ART OF ENGLISH PORTRAIT MINIATURE.

IT has been necessary to traverse the Continent from east to west, and from north to south, in tracing the different schools of miniature in the manuscripts, and in showing their influence on one another; but henceforth, owing to the genius of the master who introduced the art of portrait miniature into our island, it will be easy to show that England usurped the brilliant traditions of the continental schools, and in adopting this new phase of the art of miniature painting, she retained to herself an almost exclusive pre-eminence in the art. The art of painting in England during the latter period of the Middle Ages can hardly be said to have existed. Since the early Celtic and Anglo-Saxon schools of illumination were absorbed by French influence after the Norman Conquest, we had possessed no national school, though, as we have seen, English artists always retained distinctive characteristics in their miniatures and illuminations in books and manuscripts. One characteristic which is typically English, and may be said to be true of every period of our art, is the absence of a tendency to go to extremes. Whatever we may adopt of the prevailing motives of contemporaneous schools of art, is in some measure modified by our individualism, or perhaps some would say by a level-headed selection. This sanity of selection, or whatever other term we may apply to it, is an important factor not to be lost sight of in studying the growth and development

MINIATURES

of English art; and whilst it may in a measure be responsible for some lack of inspiration, it has also perhaps been the cause of the long periods of dormant activity and absence of taste which are only too apparent in the history of our art.

Although the name of Hans Holbein stands out in high relief in the historical records of art during the reign of Henry VIII., before considering his just claim to this pre-eminence it will be well to review the merits and characteristics of his immediate predecessors and contemporaries, whose claims to distinction as lesser lights have been dimmed well nigh to extinction by his high fame.

It may be repeated here, that it is a fallacy to consider every well-drawn portrait, in miniature or otherwise, of this period, as emanating from the hand of the master, or that Holbein's art and style were so peculiarly individualistic as to exclude the possibility of confusing his work with any other. This is not so, as will be abundantly proved by a consideration of the principles which led up to and culminated in his art and the art of his contemporaries. We have already seen that in the fifteenth century manuscripts by Netherlandish artists there are a sufficient number of excellent portraits to illustrate the natural aptitude which these artists possessed for 'catching a likeness,' and we have also noticed how the technical manner of these portraits is typical of the school of which Van Eyck was the father. They are all drawn with realistic precision, without shadows, in a broad light coming, as a rule, almost immediately from the front of the sitter. The painting was very simple in colour and execution, and what would be called technically 'tight,' at the same time possessing considerable directness of handling, solidity of tone, and minuteness of finish. Yet with all this, their conscientious rendering of individual characteristics was never trivial: it always seemed to contain a personal grasp of an aspect or impression. In fact, through all their elaboration of detail they retained their original

NETHERLANDISH PORTRAITS

inspiration, which was but intensified by their realism. The most notable characteristic of this school is the flatness and breadth of the tone and colour, undoubtedly showing the decorative impulse as a survival from the illumination of books. The costumes, the head-dresses, the accessories and backgrounds, all keep their place as essential masses of flat colour or tone, apart from their contained details. The artist's labour was devoted, not so much to the acquisition of unessential facts, as to the achievement of essential finish and breadth. Their portraits were executed with a strict regard to a certain convention: the delineation of character as distinct from the picturesque impression—a somewhat stern decorative simplicity in contradistinction to a posed mobility of treatment. Their portraits may lack grace, but not distinction; they may lack vivacity, but not life; and if they are deficient in a dramatic effect of light and shade, they attain the complete charm of fitting their well-defined limits with a masterly ease and dignity. This faculty of giving a faithful delineation of the human countenance had been in abeyance since the time of the Roman Empire, for we must remember that Roman painting was chiefly devoted to portraiture, though, no doubt, as such, their paintings would hardly satisfy modern requirements, their ideas of form being stereotyped by an ideal conventionalism. This renaissance of the art, however, was the natural result of a close individual study of nature, and its convention was the convention of a long practice in the art of decoration.

Since the period when art awoke from its monastic slumbers, and shaking off the habits of the monk had robed itself in secular attire, artists had been learning to study and take delight in the mundane aspect of men and nature. They had learned also that the faithful and loving study of nature was not detrimental or antagonistic to the purest religious motives, whilst it gave greater freedom and greater force to their expression, and in learning these things artists had, incidentally, as it were,

MINIATURES

acquired the faculty of producing portraits. This power was not weakened by any attempt at idealisation : the art of the Low Countries revealed itself through the medium of a simple and homely inspiration, little influenced at its best by the more complex and traditional classicisms of Southern schools. It is not surprising, therefore, when we consider the principles underlying Netherlandish art, that it should be the school before all others which can claim responsibility for the birth of portraiture as an independent art.

The art of the Netherlands, as I have said, depended for its inspiration primarily on its own people, and contemporaneous thought, manners, and customs ; it did not desire to idealise or to see nature through antique spectacles ; but its vitality was healthy, natural and unaffected, and its influence strong and vigorous, as we can see in its effect on German art of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. This is in marked contrast to the influence of Italian art in the sixteenth century. The first influence produced the schools of which in Germany Albert Dürer and, to some extent, Hans Holbein may be considered the leading lights ; and the latter influence cannot be credited with any but decadent painters, who mostly exaggerated all the academic mannerisms of drawing and design of the Italian masters, and gained little from them but an improved sense of colour.

Amongst the foreign portrait painters who worked in England about the same time as Holbein, and were patronised by the court, I may mention John Gossart, commonly known as Mabuse, after Maubeuge, his native place, where he was born about 1470. He was a contemporary of Dürer, and his earliest works show the influence of Gerard David and Quentin Matsys. It is said that his peculiar qualities of minute and elaborate delineation of ornamental details of every kind show to great advantage in the miniatures of the Grimani Breviary, some of which he is credited with having painted.

HOLBEIN'S CONTEMPORARIES

Lucas Cornelisz was a Dutch painter, who came to England, and he has been honoured by Walpole with having taught Holbein water-colour painting; but he was the same age as the latter, and probably came here at a later date.

Lucas de Heere, the portrait painter, a native of Ghent, must have been in England near the middle of the sixteenth century, and we know that his mother, Anne de Smytere, was an excellent miniature painter.

Sir Antonio More was a native of Utrecht, and was born either in 1512 or 1519, and died in 1576. More's style shows the distinct Italian influence which is due to his having studied under Jan Schoreel, who was a follower of the Italian Renaissance. Sir Antonio More was employed in 1552 by Charles v. to paint portraits of various members of the royal family of Spain. He came to England in order to paint the portrait of Queen Mary for Philip II. of Spain. Charles I. possessed a portrait of Mary painted by More on a small round gold plate. As the reign of this queen was short, the number of portraits painted of her had no opportunity of accumulating, and in consequence they are very scarce. Sir William Drake possesses a miniature of this queen by Sir Antonio More, and there used to be in the collection of Dr. J. Lumsden Probert another miniature of the same queen by the same painter, and also one of the Princess Elizabeth. These miniatures are painted in oil, the former being on copper and the latter on slate. In the private collection of Sir Tollemache Sinclair there is also a miniature in water-colour of Mary Queen of Scots attributed to Sir Antonio, and, as is well known, there are several important portraits at Hampton Court which this artist is credited with having painted.

There is no doubt that it was More's portraits of royal personages which obtained for him his knighthood, and he also attained the honour of placing his own portrait by himself in the Uffizi Gallery.

MINIATURES

It must be remembered that most of the painters of this period were accustomed to paint very small portraits in oil on slate, copper, and other metals. These were in reality oil miniatures, and in most cases possessed all the finish, detail, and smoothness of surface which are characteristic of a water-colour.

In those days there did not exist the same hard and fast line, which obtains now, between the oil and water-colour painter, or the miniaturist and oil-portraitist. The methods of work were similar, no matter in what scale or medium the portrait was painted. It was for a later generation of artists to discover that water-colours possessed qualities as a medium of expression which were distinct from those of oil-colours. Painters in oil had not yet attempted the various impressionistic effects of brush-work which often take the place of more solid qualities. The existing Guilds no doubt had a tendency to discourage anything which had the appearance of a lack of thoroughness in the methods of work. Artists who were members of any Guild bound themselves by a written law to produce nothing but the best that their hands and brain could execute, and the Guild took pains to see that this was duly carried out. Members remained all their lives under the control of the chief and members of the corporation, who could at any time enter their shops and examine all materials, and generally supervise their work or arrange disputes between painter and patron. In the case of an artist who badly finished or dishonestly executed a work, he was brought before the magistrates and severely punished. Under such a condition of things it is hardly surprising if there was a lack of individual enterprise, and that there existed a similarity in all painters' work. A curious and interesting illustration of the working of these laws is found in Van Eyck's signature to his portraits, to which he sometimes added the quaint motto, 'Als ikh kan,'—'As well as I can,'—an autographic voucher of his conscientiousness.

HOLBEIN'S GENIUS

The number of artists who practised the art of portrait painting during the sixteenth century makes it clear that, though Holbein undoubtedly surpassed his contemporaries, there existed other painters who were quite sufficiently skilled to have produced some of the small portraits which have been attributed to him. And it is equally obvious that Holbein's genius for portraiture, and his qualities of painting and drawing, though sufficiently individual, were not spontaneous and new creations, but the culminating excellences of a distinct school, of which there had been, previous to and during his time, many brilliant exponents.

It is, of course, much simpler to suppose, and more fascinating to believe, that the genius of one man dominated the art of his time, and was responsible for every work of any excellence, and this is true to a very great extent, for a genius inspires and sets a standard to all less gifted than himself; and so we find copyists and imitators galore, whose work may sometimes reach within measurable distance of the great originator.

When we remember also that it was a prevailing custom to duplicate portraits of notable people as presents to foreign princes or distinguished visitors, and that there were painters employed especially to produce these facsimiles, it is again not surprising that at this distance of time there must ever exist an element of doubt about all but the most authentic works.

If this doubt exists concerning life-size oil portraits where the technical mannerisms are so obvious, how much more must it exist when considering the authenticity of miniatures, the dimensions of which alone increase the difficulty a hundredfold. For these reasons I would insist that to all but the actual hero-worshipping collector, who values a name more than the work of art which it signs, it is of more value to understand the great principles which underlie a masterpiece, than to know the little accidental and incidental facts which help to authenticate a name.

MINIATURES

Several of the painters that were in the employ of Henry VIII. and successive sovereigns were also expert miniature painters, which is suggestive evidence as to the possibilities of there having existed numbers of royal and other portraits in miniature, which were painted in a Holbeinesque manner by various hands. This manner may be here briefly described as a firm yet delicate definition of the facial character in a broad, shadowless effect of light, having simple flat masses of tone and colour in the backgrounds, costumes and accessories, with minute and jewel-like treatment of details. The colouring is pure and simple, with strong contrasts between the figure and the background, and the surface is enamel-like in its solidity and velvety quality, which is obtained by opaque colours, except in the flesh, which is often left transparent and luminous. The drawing of the portrait is characterised by a masterly grasp of the essential forms, and a most subtle appreciation of their tonality, whilst the modelling is obtained by the minimum amount of delicate half-tone.

In these portraits there exists little evidence of the knowledge of chiaroscuro, which the disciples of the Italian Renaissance possessed in such a marked degree. If we study the portraits of the Italian painters of this and succeeding periods, we see that their handling of strong effects of light and shade was quite in advance of the more Northern schools.

We involuntarily associate the name of Holbein with that of Henry VIII. Our knowledge of the general appearance of the king has been made popular by the number of familiar portraits, all of which we associate with the painter; yet perhaps not one of these well-known pictures can be correctly ascribed to Holbein. But traditions proverbially die hard, and the fact that we know so much about the life and personality of Holbein, and so little comparatively about his contemporaries, helps the imagination, and it seems only fitting that a famous picture of a famous king should have been

HOLBEIN AT BASLE

executed by a famous artist. Whatever may be the real facts concerning the actual painting of these portraits, it is admittedly true that some of them at least were based upon an original one, painted by Hans ; therefore we may rightly consider these as having been inspired by the master. Apart from this association of ideas between the two men, Holbein and Henry had much in common : their physical characteristics were distinctly similar, and their temperaments were certainly not unlike. Both, tradition says, possessed quick tempers, and each, in the estate to which he was called, showed a prodigality of disposition.

It will be sufficient for my purpose if I shortly review the facts which led Holbein to be so closely connected with our English court and our English art. It is well known that Holbein's early training was gained in the studio of his father, and that with his brother Ambrosius he helped in carrying out many commissions for altar-pieces and sacred subjects. His artistic career commenced at Augsburg, where he was born in 1497, but at eighteen years of age he went with his brother to Basle, which at that time was the northern centre of the great revival in literature and learning. Hans soon showed his ability as a portrait painter by painting the portraits of the burgomaster, Jacob Meyer, and his wife, now in the Basle Museum, and it was here that he was first introduced to the great Antwerp scholar, Desiderius Erasmus, who visited Basle in connection with the publication of his books. Erasmus proved himself an enthusiastic patron of the young artist, and not only employed him himself, but introduced him to many others. For about ten years Holbein was busy painting, decorating, and making designs for woodcut illustrations. The most famous of his sacred subjects is the 'Meyer' Madonna, painted in 1526, for the burgomaster of that name, and it is of especial interest to us, as it contains masterly portraits of Jacob Meyer and his family kneeling in adoration at the feet of the Virgin Mary. The beautiful

MINIATURES

and significant treatment of this picture combines the most absolute realism in the characterisation of the portraits, with the most idyllic reserve and religious fervour. In it is symbolised the worship and reverence for Divine Maternity. It is a mediæval motive, painted with Flemish realism, but softened by classic culture, and this picture would be sufficient alone to justify Holbein's reputation, as it also may make us regret his divergence from this branch of the arts.

Circumstances about this time combined to alter the course of Holbein's life. The religious dissensions which were agitating the whole of Switzerland, and Basle in particular, made the arts an ever increasingly precarious means of living, to which were added Holbein's improvident disposition and his increasing domestic responsibilities—for he had married a widow with one son in 1520. In August of the year 1526 we find Holbein, therefore, starting on his first visit to England, armed with an introduction to Sir Thomas More, which his patron Erasmus had given him.

Holbein's reputation as a portrait-painter had preceded him, for Sir Thomas had received as a gift from Erasmus one of the finest portraits which the painter had executed of that scholar, and it is probably the one now at Longford Castle. No artist could wish for better credentials than these, and we know that More received his guest with every mark of honour for that artist's genius. During his first visit to England, Holbein appears only to have painted the More family and their own circle of influential friends. This series of portraits includes several well-authenticated examples which still exist, notably the two portraits of William Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, at Lambeth Palace and the Louvre, two fine drawings in the British Museum and at Windsor, and the portraits of Sir Henry and Lady Guildford, Sir Brian Tuke, and John Fisher, of which only sketches exist, and several others. But the most important of all is the large portrait group of Sir Thomas More and his

HOLBEIN'S MINIATURES

family. Of the several versions of this work which exist, none are considered to be the genuine work of Holbein, but the authentic sketch for the composition is one of the treasures of the Basle Museum, and there are also some studies for the individual heads of the sitters at Windsor. In connection with this picture there is a very interesting miniature portrait group in the possession of Major-General Sotheby. This little picture measures $11\frac{1}{2}$ inches by $9\frac{1}{2}$, and is painted on vellum; the left-hand portion is a slightly varied copy of the family group by Holbein, and in it we have an authentic representation, in his judge's robes, of Sir John More, father of Sir Thomas More. Next to him sits Sir Thomas himself, and there are also his three daughters, his only son John, and John's wife Anne Cresacre, who stands behind her father-in-law. To this group the painter, who was probably Peter Oliver, has added a second one, consisting of John More's son Thomas, his wife Mary Scrope, and two of their sons. The difference in costume between the two groups is noticeable, and the right-hand portion of the picture, despite its chronological incongruity, is interesting on account of the view in the background of More's garden at Chelsea, with London in the distance. This beautifully finished miniature contains in all eleven portraits. The male figures are especially well drawn, and the colouring is very fine, the red and purple robes of the left-hand figures contrasting beautifully with the curtains of blue, yellow, and gold, on which are placed the arms of the More family. The miniature now rests in a cabinet which has been specially made to fit it, at Major-General Sotheby's house near Billing, and is only one of a collection of treasured miniatures of which I shall have occasion to speak later.

Now we come to the question of Holbein's miniatures, and here we are met with the proverbial scepticism of some authorities, who throw doubt upon the probability of his ever having painted miniatures at all. Fortunately we possess direct evidence that he did,

MINIATURES

in the assertion which his successor, Nicholas Hilliard, makes on the subject. He says, in a treatise which he wrote on the art:—‘Holbein’s manner of limning I have ever imitated, and hold it for the best’—and this should suffice to convince the most sceptical, even if we did not possess certain incomparable examples which cannot be attributed to any hand but the great master’s.

It is believed that prior to his visit to England Holbein had not practised the art of water-colour, although we know that in oil, in fresco, and in wood-engraving his art was well matured, and his reputation, though comparatively local, was considerable. It seems therefore rather superfluous to suppose that a painter of such genius and experience required teaching in the lesser art; but let me review the comedy of errors in this connection for what it is worth.

Walpole says:—‘Holbein painted in oil, in distemper, and water-colours. He had never practised the last till he came to England, where he learned it of Lucas Cornelisz, and carried it to the highest perfection. His miniatures have all the strength of oil colours, joined to the most finished delicacy.’ Now there is a certain ‘Master Lucas’ whom Van Mander speaks of as Holbein’s master, but this could hardly be Cornelisz, for, as we have seen in the last chapter, the latter was born the same year as Holbein, was obliged by the necessities of a wife and family to seek work in England, and must have arrived here considerably later than Holbein, which, as Dr. Propert remarks, disposes of the Walpole assertion. There were at least three other artists of the same time who claimed the name of Lucas; they were Lucas van Leyden, Lucas Cranach, and Lucas Hornebolt. The first two never seem to have been in England, and so we are forced by circumstantial evidence to give the last named, Lucas Hornebolt, the prior claim to the honour. This unfortunately does not land us out of our difficulties, but would seem rather to involve us in an eddy of further doubts, for, as Bradley remarks, there

HOLBEIN AND HENRY VIII.

were no fewer than nineteen artists of this or a similar name exercising their art in Ghent between 1414 and 1540, and there appear to have been about as many varieties of spelling.

The generally accepted theory is that Lucas Hornebolt was the son of Gerard Hornebolt, and therefore brother to Susannah, whom we have already mentioned. It is pretty certain that all three were employed by Henry VIII. Gerard was in the king's service at a monthly pay of 33s. 4d., and is said to have died in England as court painter to Philip and Mary in 1558. His son Lucas was also a 'king's servant' at a higher salary even than Holbein, namely 55s. 6d. per month, and the date of his death is fixed by a curious entry in one of the household books of Henry VIII. We are given the date of the payment for April 1544, but the following month there is this entry:—'Item, for Lewke Hornebonde, paynter, wages nil, quia mortuus.'

It is well to remember that at the time of Holbein's first visit to England, Catherine of Aragon was Henry's queen, but her reign in the king's good graces was already waning in favour of Anne Boleyn. This is a circumstantial argument against any of the existing portraits of Catherine being authentic Holbeins, especially in view of the fact that we possess no evidence whatever to show that he was known to the king at this time. Another circumstance which has interest, as bearing on the probable date of many of the portraits of the king, is the change in the fashion of wearing the hair. Up to the year 1535, the hair was cut across the forehead and hung down lower than the ears, all round the head, as in Henry VII.'s reign; but in Stowe's *Annals* it is mentioned that on May 8, 1535, 'the King commanded all about his Court to poll their heads, and to give them example, he caused his own head to be polled, and from thenceforth his beard to be notted and no more shaven.' This would, of course, put out of court all portraits of Henry as being by Holbein which represent the

MINIATURES

former clean shaved or with long hair, as the latter in all probability did not work for the king prior to the date of this command.

It is certain that Holbein found his visit to this country in every way satisfactory from a pecuniary point of view, for, after being here about two years, he returned to Basle, where he purchased house property and remained four years.

The town, however, was still the centre of religious dissensions, and Holbein, on account of his religious opinions, was not free from the prevailing persecution, and there was little inducement for him to stay, although he seems to have painted at this time, amongst other pictures, a portrait of his wife and two children, and a new portrait of Erasmus. The latter, which is a small round one, is considered to be the original of many copies which exist at different places. In 1532 he came back to this country, and took no heed of an offer made by the authorities of Basle, to give him a fixed salary if he would return there.

For the first year or two of his second stay in England, Holbein was closely connected with the group of German and Netherlandish merchants who formed the Hanseatic League, and was employed by them in various ways—to paint their portraits and adorn their halls. At the coronation of Anne Boleyn in 1533, it was Holbein who designed the triumphal arch erected by this league. There does not exist any evidence to prove that Holbein was in Henry VIII.'s service until 1536. His friend and patron Sir Thomas More had risen and fallen in the royal esteem since the painter's first visit, and there were, as I have mentioned in my last chapter, a number of English and foreign artists who were already in the king's employ, and these circumstances may have combined to hinder his entry into royal favour.

The first documentary evidence of a salary being paid to the painter is in the book of payments of the

HOLBEIN'S DEATH

royal household, on Lady Day 1538, when he received £7, 10s. As the accounts of the preceding years are not in existence, it is not fair to assume that this was necessarily the first instalment. The last recorded note concerning Holbein is in the accounts of the Treasurer of the Household for midsummer of the year 1541:— 'Ao. xxxiii; item, for Hans Holbyn, paynter, nihil quia prius.'

It was not until the important discovery of Holbein's will by Sir A. W. Franks and Mr. Black that the date of the painter's death was made certain. Before this discovery, portraits of Edward VI. were assigned to him with impunity and confidence. Unfortunately, this will, which was dated October 7, 1543, was also proved to have been administrated on November 29, 1543, by a note which was found in the Registry of the Wills of the Commissary of London, preserved in St. Paul's Cathedral. This proves altogether, once and for all, the fallacy of attributing any portraits of Edward VI. to Holbein, except those of the prince when quite a child—such, for instance, as the one which we illustrate, from the Montagu House collection (Plate IV.).

A further link, if it were necessary, is supplied by a letter written by Burgomaster Adleberg Meyer to Jacob David, goldsmith in Paris. Speaking of Philip, Holbein's son, he mentions that the father is already deceased. So from this evidence we may be quite certain that Hans Holbein the younger died in London in 1543, the year of the plague, sometime between October 7 and November 29. It is possible that he was one of its victims, though if it is a fact that this fell disease struck men down without a minute's warning, he would hardly have been able to make a will.

It was in 1537 that Holbein painted the great picture representing the two kings, Henry VII. and Henry VIII., and their two queens, Elizabeth of York and Jane Seymour. Van Mander speaks of it in enthusiastic terms, as he saw it in 1604 on the walls of the Privy

MINIATURES

Chamber at Whitehall; but it was destroyed in the fire of 1698. It is important to remember that many of the other portraits of Henry VIII., whether in miniature or otherwise, were based on this Whitehall portrait. Authorities state that the only authentic portraits in existence of Henry by Holbein are a beautiful square portrait at Althorp and a chalk drawing at Munich. It is not for me here to question these authorities, but rather to mention those portraits in little which I have seen in several famous collections, and describe them with due regard for the reputation of the famous artist to whom they are attributed. I may as well commence by saying that there are very few miniatures indeed which can be authoritatively ascribed to Holbein. At the same time, there are many which are either excellent copies, imitative paintings, or genuine originals.

The royal collection at Windsor undoubtedly contains the finest examples of authentic miniatures by the master. Most notable amongst them are the portraits of Henry and Charles, sons of Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, who both died on the same day, in 1551, of the sweating sickness; and two magnificent portraits of Catherine Howard and Lady Dudley.

The one of the boy Henry, leaning on his left arm, is full of childish character and charm, and is designed to fit the circle, with a natural ease, and yet with great decorative feeling. He wears a black cap with white feathers, and a black coat with green sleeves, blond hair cut short, and the miniature is painted with a blue ground on the back of a playing-card. It has the inscription 'AETATIS SVAE 5. 6 SEPDEM ANNO 1535.' Charles Brandon is dressed in a grey and red coat with black cuffs, his shirt collar is embroidered with black thread, and it also has a blue ground and the inscription 'ANN 1541 ETATIS SVAE 3. 10 MARCI.' Both miniatures are circles of a little under two inches, and both are painted on the backs of playing-cards, which was a very favourite surface for miniaturists to work on, owing

HOLBEIN'S MINIATURES AT WINDSOR

to the excellence of the card and smoothness of its finish.

Two characteristics which are peculiarly Holbeinesque may be mentioned here—his predilection for the circle, and his decorative skill in placing his subject within it so as to give an almost medallion-like dignity to the figure. This is especially noticeable of the Catherine Howard portrait, which is the only authentic portrait of this queen.

There are also in the royal collection four miniatures of Henry VIII. which have been attributed to Holbein, but this has been conclusively proved by Mr. Wornum to be erroneous. He says: 'Three of these portraits appear to have been executed before Holbein came to England, and the fourth after our painter's death.' The first, he proves by the inscription, was painted in 1526, and it represents the king clean shaven, with long, bright brown hair. The second is a circular miniature, nearly identical with the first, except that the face is nowhere shaven; the age seems about the same. Both these miniatures are said to have belonged to Charles I., to whom they were given, according to tradition, by Lord Suffolk. They are catalogued in a MS. by Vanderdoort, at Windsor, but they are not in that catalogue ascribed to Holbein. They are numbered 48 and 49.

The third miniature is an oval, $1\frac{9}{10}$ inches in height. The face, as in the other two, is three-quarter, turned to the left, and is young and much the same in other respects as that of the first, especially as regards the long hair and the absence of beard. It is inscribed 'H. R. VIII. AN^o xxxv.,' with H. and K. combined in a lover's knot above, the K. necessarily signifying Queen Katherine of Aragon, as the portrait is evidently not that of the king when advanced in age.

The fourth is an oil miniature on paper, fixed on an oak panel, and is a circle of $2\frac{5}{6}$ inches in diameter, with a green ground, inscribed, 'HENR. 8. REX. ANGL. AETA : S. 57.' It is full face, in hat and feather, with

MINIATURES

a fur collar, close under the chin. The face, with scarcely any hair and a thin beard, is of the same type as that so familiar to us in the ordinary portraits of the king.

The age on the miniature is an error. Henry VIII. never entered his fifty-seventh year; having been born in 1491, he would only have attained his fifty-sixth birthday if he had survived until the 28th June 1547. So we see by this that the discovery of the correct date of Hans Holbein's death, 1543, has quite upset the accuracy of this last attribution, unless some proof may be found that the inscription has been added at a later period.

There are other reasons for throwing considerable doubt on not a few of the existing miniatures of King Henry attributed to Holbein, for many of the portraits of the king were painted prior to the reception of Hans into royal favour—those, for instance, by the Hornebolts—Lucas, his sister Susannah, or even their father Gerard Hornebolt, all of whom were employed by Henry VIII., and all quite capable of painting excellent miniatures in the Flemish manner. Then there are several others, such as Mabuse, Lucas Cornelisz, Sir Antonio More, and later, Mrs. Teerlinck, Gwillim Stretes, or Justus van Cleef, etc., none of whose portraits in connection with the court, with the exception of Levina Teerlinck's, are authoritatively known to exist.

It is well here to mention that it was a common custom of Holbein's to make a preliminary drawing in chalks of a sitter whose portrait he was going to paint, and the collection of these magnificent drawings, which is now at Windsor Castle, should be a useful guide to the authenticity of the finished portraits in oil or water-colour; but very few can be identified. It is related how Queen Caroline, wife of George IV., found this noble collection of Holbein's original drawings for the portraits of some of the chief personages of the Court of Henry VIII., in a bureau at Kensington. How they came there is quite unknown. There is, however, a very curious MS. in the British

HOLBEIN'S DRAWINGS

Museum (Harl. 6000) in which an account of these limnings is given, which greatly elucidates the subject. It was evidently written in the reign of Charles I., and was probably compiled from the notes of Hilliard. The MS. says:—‘I shall not need to insist upon the particulars of this manner of working; it shall suffice, if you please, to take a view of a booke of pictures by the life, of the incomparable Hans Holbein, servant to King Henry VIII. They are the pictures of most of the English lords and ladies then living, and were the patterns whereby that excellent painter made his pictures in oyl; and they are all done in this last manner of crayons.’ Further on this MS. says:—‘You will find in these ruinous remains an admirable hand, and a rare manner of working in few lines, and no labour in expressing of the life and likenesses, many times equal to his own, and excelling other men’s, oyl-pictures.’

There are eighty-four of these drawings at Windsor, and most of them are executed on a flesh-coloured paper, apparently in black and red chalk and charcoal. The eyes, hair, and beards are usually coloured to their natural tints, and the brush is sometimes used to add finish and delicacy to the modelling.

In another MS. bequeathed by Dr. Rawlinson to the Bodleian Library (No. 336), entitled ‘Miniature, or the Arte of Limning,’ by Edward Norgate, after treating of crayons the writer says:—‘A better way was used by Holbein, by pinning a large paper with a carnation or complexion of flesh colour, whereby he made pictures by the life, of many great lords and ladies of his time, with black and red chalke, with other flesh colour, made up hard and dry, like small pencil sticks.’

These chalk drawings are usually a little less than life-size, and are drawn with such subtle dexterity, that though there appears to be little labour in their production, we have only to see them to realise what admirable guides they must have been to paint from. Perhaps in these slight, dexterous, and penetrating character studies,

MINIATURES

so full of thought, grasp, and unaffected insistence upon every detail, we can realise the genius of the artist better than in the more complete works.

In the magnificent collection of miniatures in Montagu House, owned by the Duke of Buccleuch, there are many Holbeinesque miniatures, and a few undoubtedly genuine originals. Perhaps the most interesting is the portrait of Hans by himself. It is a small circle miniature of $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches, three-quarter face to the right, wearing a black cap on his head, and in his raised right hand a pencil. It is most delicate in colouring and modelling. He is wearing a square beard but no moustache, and, as is almost the rule, it has a blue background. It is inscribed 'H.H. AN. 1543. AETATIS SUAE 45,' and it came from Walpole's collection at Strawberry Hill, and is described by Wornum in his work on Holbein (Plate iv.). Another exquisite miniature by Holbein is of Edward VI. when a boy of about five years old. This is an oval miniature of $1\frac{1}{4}$ inches, and is a beautifully drawn and painted representation of the prince, with a blue background. It is in a quaint black, white, and gold enamel frame, and probably belonged to Charles I., and was given him by Sir Henry Vane (Plate iv.).

The collection contains, amongst other miniatures attributed to Holbein, one of Henry VIII., in a circle of one and a half inches. This portrait shows the king clean shaved, three-quarter face to the left, wearing a black round hat, and a doublet of grey and brown edged with fur. The circle has a square margin of gold on which are painted figures in red outline, and the whole is enframed in a very beautiful blue, white, and gold enamel frame. This one also came from the Strawberry Hill collection, and, although a most excellent example, is wrongly attributed to the master. There are one or two other miniatures of the same king, the most interesting being the one which was found by Mr. Mackay, of Colnaghi's, belonging to a lady living at Wandsworth. It is described in Vertue's catalogue, and represents the



Henry VIII
BY HOLBEIN

Henry VIII
ATTRIBUTED TO HOLBEIN

Hans Holbein
BY HIMSELF

Edward VI
BY HOLBEIN

RECENT DISCOVERIES

king with a beard and in a most elaborate dress. It is considered to be by Holbein (Plate iv.). The copy of the Catherine Howard Windsor portrait is also here, and is attributed to Isaac Oliver, and there are two of Catherine of Aragon which are said to be by Holbein. There is also a very excellent miniature of Sir Thomas More at Montagu House, which is attributed to the same master and is in every way worthy of him.

Walpole is of the opinion that 'many of the Holbein miniatures were preserved in carved ivory and ebony boxes, in Charles I.'s cabinet, and some of them perished in the Whitehall fire in 1698,' which would certainly help to account for so few existing.

Two extremely interesting examples of Holbein's miniature painting have been brought to light recently, and in view of the scarcity of authentic miniatures by this master it is important to record them here. One was discovered by Mr. Richard Holmes, as belonging to the collection of the Queen of Holland, and was excellently reproduced in photogravure in the *Burlington Magazine*, vol. i. p. 219. It represents a youth turned three-quarter face to the left. The other was sold on May 15 of this year (1904) at Christie and Manson's as part of Mr. C. Heywood Hawkins's collection, and was bought by Messrs. Duveen Brothers for £2750. This was also beautifully reproduced in the *Burlington*, vol. v. p. 332. Neither of these miniatures has at present been identified as to subject, though the exquisite beauty of their drawing and restrained expression, combined with the subtlety of their finish, make their authenticity practically beyond question. The Hawkins miniature is of a lady turned three-quarter face to the left, wearing a white linen cap, with the white lawn of her *chemisette* showing beneath a simple black velvet bodice. The background is of a deep blue, and in her bosom is a red carnation. This, with a touch of gold in the filigree ends of a cord round her neck, completes the harmony of colour. The catalogue title of 'Frances Howard, Duchess

MINIATURES

of Norfolk,' is quite erroneous, as there was no such person of that period. Across the blue ground there is written in gold letters the inscription, 'ANNO AETATIS SUAE 23.'

In considering the miniatures of the Holbein school, I may mention a very fine oil example in the same collection, of Desiderius Erasmus, painted by Lucas Cranach. It is a circle of about 4 inches in diameter, and is framed in an elaborately ornamented tortoiseshell frame. It represents the scholar when very old, with a black hat, and a cloak trimmed with fur; he is turned three-quarter face to the right, against a dark green background, and it is in every way an excellent painting, though, as compared with the work of Holbein, the half-tones are somewhat heavy. Besides the miniatures already mentioned, there are examples attributed to Holbein, belonging to Major-General Sotheby, Sir Francis Cook, Sir William R. Drake, the Duke of Portland, the Seymour family, and in the Wallace collection.

It is impossible to draw a distinct line between the life-size portraits of Hans Holbein and his miniatures. In both we recognise the master hand and eye, and whether we look at a face limned to the scale of one inch, or painted full life-size, we see equally in both the same great principles, the same breadth of handling, the same grasp of character. Were both forms of portraiture reduced to the same scale, we could detect no appreciable difference. The larger examples, in their technical qualities, possess the same finish of surface which is so characteristic of the smaller, and his water-colours have almost the strength and vigour of the oil pictures.

It is this unsurpassable excellence in the quality of his technique which makes the work of Holbein so important in the history of miniature painting. His finish is essential to the complete expression of his art, which is large in its rendering, no matter on what scale it is produced. It never surprises us by its minuteness

HOLBEIN AND VAN EYCK

or elaboration ; it never excites us with its skill or cleverness ; but it absolutely convinces us, and appeals to our senses with a strength of realism which is something more than real.

In the art of this painter we see the culminating excellences of a century of painters.

It is difficult to define exactly the degree of difference which exists between this last master of the school and Van Eyck, its founder. If the truth be told, I have seen examples of the portraiture of both these masters side by side, which would do credit to either. But in the later painter the same qualities, though more matured, are less apparent : the finish, which is carried farther, is less obvious ; the character, which is less defined, is more realistic and lifelike ; and the flatness of tone and colour, typical of both, in the later is mellower and less academic. In the portraits of Holbein we see the influence of a more refined and cultured inspiration, and a greater mastery over the essential technicalities of this school. Whatever Holbein may have gained from his study of Italian art, and it is evident that he owed much to its influence, there can be no two opinions that, in his portraiture, he was essentially a Fleming, and remained true to the traditions of that school. His breadth, his flatness, his finish, his technique, all show his lineage, but his extraordinary power of expression, his depth of insight into the character of his sitter, and his subtle rendering of the latent force behind the external mask, were individual and belonged to himself alone.

If we look at the mobility of a mouth, the light and life in the eyes, the finesse of the hair or beard, or even the delicacy of some jewelled embroidery, we see in each the simple, unaffected genius of the painter, the appreciative grasp of the great artist.

CHAPTER IV

THE FIRST EPOCH OF ENGLISH MINIATURE PAINTING—
NICHOLAS HILLIARD, ISAAC AND PETER OLIVER,
AND THEIR CONTEMPORARIES.

BEFORE taking a final leave of foreign miniaturists, in order to devote our attention to the long line of eminent English painters, it is necessary once more to call to mind the names of several Dutch artists who gained reputations at our English court, and painted here about the time that young Edward VI. came to the throne. These artists represent the connecting link between Holbein and Nicholas Hilliard, and it is probable that had all their work been signed, their reputation to-day would be as considerable as it must have been at the time in which they lived.

I have already mentioned in a previous chapter Simon Benninck and his daughter, Levina Teerlinck. The father, as we have seen, was a famous illuminator of Bruges, whose portraits in the illuminations of *The Royal Houses of Spain and Portugal* are in many ways worthy of the Holbein school. Benninck is supposed to have visited England; at any rate, we know that his daughter Levina Teerlinck was in King Henry's service in 1538, at a higher salary than Holbein. She is spoken of in the highest terms by Vasari, and Mr. J. G. Nichols gives many interesting details about her. In the year 1547, when Edward VI. came to the throne, 'Maistris Levyn Teerling, paintrix, was receiving quarterly wages of £10.' In 1556 she presented to Queen Mary, as a

LEVINA TEERLINCK—GWILLIM STRETES

New Year's gift, a small picture of the 'Trynitie,' and again in 1558, the year of the accession of Queen Elizabeth, she presented 'the Queen's picture finely painted on a card,' and there is another record of an interesting item which she executed for this queen. It was a box on which was 'finely painted the Queen's persone' and other personages, and it was so 'highly prized by Elizabeth that she insisted on keeping it in her own charge.' As payment for this work, it is curious to read that Levina received 'a salt cellar, gilt, with a lid weighing together $5\frac{1}{2}$ ounces.' So it is quite evident that this lady was in high court favour during four successive reigns, and the only wonder is that there exist so very few known examples of her work. During this long period of royal patronage she must have produced many portraits 'in little,' and the conclusion we must come to is, that in default of a signature they are attributed to Holbein, Hilliard, or to some other contemporary.

There used to be a miniature of Edward VI. in Dr. Probert's collection, which he attributed to Mrs. Teerlinck. It is described as being thin and weak in tone but correct in drawing and colour, and is one of the few miniatures which have been attributed with any confidence to her hand.

Gwillim Stretes, a Dutch painter, who is of the same time as Levina Teerlinck, must be mentioned as another court painter to Edward VI. in 1551. Strype records that the king paid 'fifty marks for recompense of three great tables made by the said Gwillim, whereof two were the pictures of His Highness sent to Sir Thomas Hoby and Sir John Mason; the third a picture of the late Earl of Surrey, attainted, and by the Council's commandment fetched from the said Gwillim's home.'

An excellent portrait of Edward VI. by Stretes was formerly at Hamilton Palace, where it was called a Holbein, but since the death of this painter has been proved to have taken place when King Edward was but

MINIATURES

six years old, this is of course a fallacy. Stretes had the comparatively high salary of £62, 10s. a year from the king, which points to the conclusion that his reputation among his contemporaries was more important than is generally supposed. There is no doubt that he could produce very excellent small portraits in oil, which in point of technique closely resembled Holbein's work.

There is a portrait of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, at Hampton Court, which is much more likely to be by Stretes than by Holbein, being too weak in drawing and too poor in the landscape for the latter, although it is a very fine portrait. It is uncertain whether it can be the portrait of the earl mentioned previously, as it cannot be traced in any of the old catalogues under Surrey's name. There is more probability of the portraits by these two artists, Levina and Stretes, being erroneously attributed to Holbein, than perhaps any other painter's work, as they were both intimately connected with the court at a later date, and very possibly copied from the originals of the earlier master.

The period following the accession of Queen Elizabeth was noteworthy for the work of Nicholas Hilliard, the first English portrait miniaturist. Many artists, as we have seen, turned to this art as a kind of relaxation or change from other manners and methods, but Hilliard early in life adopted it as his profession and remained faithful to his choice, producing an extraordinary number of portraits of famous and distinguished people.

Nicholas was born at Exeter about 1547, and was the son of Richard Hilliard, high sheriff in 1560. It was as a goldsmith that he began life—a craft which has always been closely associated with that of the miniaturist, and his miniatures possess an unique jewel-like quality, which in a great measure shows the influence of this early training. Their exquisite and delicate elaboration of jewels, embroideries, and lace gives them the distinction of fine filigree work, set with precious stones. The general flat and shadowless rendering of his miniatures is closely

HILLIARD'S METHODS

akin to the work of the old illuminators, and though we know by his own assertions that he took Holbein as a model, he retained an individuality which was his own ; whilst in respect to actual force in the drawing and painting of his faces, he cannot be said to compare with the earlier master. His chief charm was a minute decorative delicacy of painting and drawing, but his portraits are always lacking in vitality and vigour, the flesh-colour and modelling being both weak and deficient.

If tradition is true, when Hilliard was appointed portrait painter to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth, he was enjoined 'to make pictures of her body and person in small compass in lymnyng only,' and 'without shadows,' which latter, it is presumed, Her Majesty thought unbecoming. This would account in great measure for Hilliard's prevailing peculiarity of style, as no doubt the fashion which royalty set was accepted as the best of all possible manners by his other sitters.

Hilliard frequently used the circle form, like his predecessors, but as often used the oval. He was fond of a lightish blue background, and he always placed his subject within the frame with great decorative sense, taking every advantage of the stiff Elizabethan collar and ruff, the embroidered bodices and jewelled head-dresses, of his distinguished sitters. His use of gold was skilful and refined, and was eminently suited to his illuminative style. Tone, as an artist understands the word, played little part in his scheme of expression, and even quality of handling or technique is conspicuous by its absence, with the exception perhaps of one or two male portraits that I have seen, where a greater depth of colour and a greater solidity have been achieved.

His method of painting was to use solid opaque colours in the background and figures, with a thin wash of white in the faces, over which he delicately drew and stippled the features and carnations. His colour has in many cases, where exposed to the light, faded, and this is especially so with the flesh-tints of his ladies' portraits.

MINIATURES

Hilliard was in great favour at the courts of Queen Elizabeth and James I., and was employed in the capacity of goldsmith, miniaturist, and medallist. James I. gave him the title of 'royal enamel painter and embosser of his gold medals.' There are innumerable examples of his work extant, many of which bear his well-known signature NH, but even when unsigned they are easy to be distinguished, though the earlier miniatures by Isaac Oliver, his contemporary, or even Sir Antonio More, have many qualities in common with them.

It is by his portraits of Queen Elizabeth that Hilliard is best known. The royal collection at Windsor at one time contained many examples of his work: fourteen are mentioned in the catalogue of King Charles I.'s collection, including portraits of Queen Elizabeth, but these last are no longer to be found. There are, however, four fine specimens of his work still in the collection, which formed part of a golden jewel. They represent the portraits of Henry VII., Henry VIII., and Edward VI. after Holbein, and King Edward's mother, Jane Seymour. This curious jewel is described in the Charles catalogue. On the top was an enamelled representation of the battle of Bosworth, and on the reverse the red and white roses of Lancaster and York. It is said to have been purchased by the king from Hilliard's son Laurence, and it was probably entirely the work of Nicholas in his capacity of court jeweller. There are two or three other jewels containing miniatures by Hilliard, which are fortunately still intact. One of great value gives us the likeness of James I. in its contemporary diamond setting. This was sold in the Hamilton sale for the large sum of £2855. And lastly, there is the miniature of Mary Queen of Scots, in its original setting with a pendent jewel, containing a lock of her hair, which is in the Jeffery Whitehead collection.

Queen Elizabeth's lovely little prayer-book contains a miniature of the Duke d'Alençon at the commencement, and at the end another of the queen, both of which are examples of Hilliard's work, of the highest possible

MINIATURES OF QUEEN ELIZABETH

quality. This little book, which measures only 3 inches by 2 inches, is bound in shagreen, with gold enamelled clasps, in the centre of each of which there is a ruby. It has passed through the hands of many notable people, from James II., the Duke of Berwick, Horace Walpole, the Duchess of Portland, to Queen Charlotte, for whom it was bought for £106, 1s. It finally came to the collection of Mr. Whitehead. The text consists of six prayers, composed and written in a very beautiful hand by Queen Elizabeth herself, in English, French, Latin, Greek, and Italian, on vellum, in sixty-five pages, and it bears eloquent testimony to the skill and culture of old Roger Ascham's illustrious pupil.

Of the many miniatures representing Queen Elizabeth assigned to Hilliard, the Montagu House collection contains two excellent specimens. The collection possesses many other examples by this artist, including a portrait of himself and one of his father. It is interesting to notice that in his portraits of Queen Elizabeth the pose and position of the head is almost identical, but the fashion of doing the hair is varied: in the two just mentioned, one has the hair curled high over the forehead, and in the other it is done smoothly over a raised pad. There is a quaint little square miniature, with an arched top, of the Princess Mary when a child, in a loose pinafore, seated in a blue and gold arm-chair, which is attributed to Hilliard, but this is impossible, and there are also two large square miniatures measuring 10 inches by 7, representing full-length portraits of the Earl of Cumberland and Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, with elaborate backgrounds of interiors. The costumes in these miniatures are wonderfully rich and full of detail, and gold is made considerable use of. Their style is entirely in the manner of earlier book illuminations, being quite flat and devoid of shadow or chiaroscuro.

There are many miniatures by Hilliard in other collections, the largest number formerly being in Dr. Propert's; but this collection, with its many precious

MINIATURES

specimens of the art, was disposed of to various collectors by the Fine Art Society in the year 1897.

Major-General Sotheby possesses three or four very interesting examples. The finest, from an artist's point of view, is the Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex. It is an oval miniature of $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches, and is exceptionally good in the colour of its flesh-tints, and, for a Hilliard, strong in drawing. The background is the typical blue, which is carried out in a blue ribbon round the neck. The earl has a yellowish square beard, a white ruff and gold collar, and gold is also used in the doublet. This miniature is very complete in every way, and is an excellent example of the artist's more solid treatment in a man's portrait. There is the usual Hilliard portrait of Queen Elizabeth with its elaborated jewellery and lace, but the face in this one is even slighter than usual, with no indication of colour except on the lips, and it is quite apparent that though the carnations may have faded away, there never was anything but the faintest suggestion of either colour or modelling. A miniature of Thomas Ratcliffe, Earl of Sussex, is curious, as it is unfinished, except in the head, which is very good, and is surmounted by a quaint tall hat; the doublet is carefully outlined in with sepia, preparatory to being painted, and the usual absence of detail and solidity helps to give force to the portraiture (Plate vi.).

The miniature of the Earl of Cumberland is interesting for its gold armour, and in place of the proverbial blue background we have a grey, cloudy one. In other respects it is a very worthy miniature by this master, the definition of character being good and delicately emphasised (Plate v.). But to refer to an exceptionally interesting example, which is one of several belonging to the Duke of Portland, the beautiful portrait of Elizabeth when young is perhaps the most complete of any I have seen. It is a rectangular panel of $3\frac{1}{2}$ inches in length, and represents the queen seated, and wearing a beautiful gold-embroidered robe and holding the sceptre and orb in her hands. On her head, which is turned



Princess Elizabeth.

George Clifford, 3rd Earl of Cumberland.

W. HOLLAND HILLIARD

HILLIARD COMPARED WITH HOLBEIN

full-face, she wears a crown, from beneath which flows a mass of fair hair. It is very delicately and gracefully drawn and painted, and it is also most decorative in its treatment and composition. It is excellent as showing the dexterous use of gold in the miniatures of this period (Plate v.). It does not appear to be signed, and considering the age of the queen, Hilliard must have been very young when he painted it, but there are other miniatures which he is reputed to have painted when only thirteen.

As showing the increasing interest taken in Hilliard's miniatures, I may refer to the recent sale at Christie and Manson's of the pair of small portraits of John Croker and his wife Frances, daughter of Sir William Kingsmill of Hampshire. After some spirited bidding these were sold to Messrs. Hodgkins for the large sum of £2400. John Croker is represented three-quarter face turned to the right, with long curling dark-brown hair, wearing a large embroidered ruff and quilted white doublet, painted on a blue background. His wife is viewed three-quarter face turned to the right, with curling flaxen hair, wearing a large embroidered ruff, black dress, ropes of pearls, and a jewel on her left breast.

Whatever opinion we may hold with regard to the art of Nicholas Hilliard, we have to admit that it lacks the larger and masterly qualities so characteristic of the painter whom he took as a model. In comparison with Holbein, his art is effeminate, thin, and toneless. Even his great skill of elaboration charms us principally by its minuteness and finesse of handling, rather than its richness of quality and colour, as in the greater master.

Hilliard's art will not inspire the student: his excellences are the excellences of a craftsman well trained in the use of his tools, rather than of the artist inspired by nature, and instinct with individuality. As I have said, he was devoid of the ability to attain that distinction which subtle tonality of colour gives to the work of Holbein. His flatness was not only obtained by an absence of shadow, but also by a comparative absence of

MINIATURES

tone and lack of modelling. And yet, notwithstanding this, his miniatures possess a charm and distinction of their own, because of their simplicity of motive, skilfully realised.

Holbein possessed an extraordinary power of suggesting modelling and rotundity, without the use of shadows, and with only the most subtle suggestions of half-tones. His flesh qualities were excellent, and even in the smallest miniature we feel this painter-like quality, but in Hilliard we recognise at once that he is not a painter, but a draughtsman and designer, using his subject and materials merely as a jeweller, to produce a beautiful jewel. And this he undoubtedly achieved with a delicacy which was worthy of his art.

With our present-day judgment of what constitutes a good portrait, trained as our eyes have been by the later and more matured inspiration of greater geniuses in the art, and also by their vast army of clever imitators, it is difficult at once to appreciate the subtle, delicate, and personal charm of the finely pencilled portraits by Nicholas Hilliard. To do so, we must understand the artist's motive, and place ourselves within the same artistic atmosphere. This was the atmosphere of the clear daylight, where there was no tonality, no shadow, no mystery, only details—details of drawing, pattern, and colour. It was an atmosphere where everything was in an equal light, and where the artist's object was only to attain the perfect balance of every minute detail, in its proper scale of proportion and with a fitting delicacy of handling. We have since learned to see and paint other qualities, in other manners—we have grown more complex in our thought, and more complete in our knowledge of what is beautiful in nature and possible in art. We have learned something of the true value of a cultivated and educated impression, inspired by this fuller knowledge, and in consequence we demand in a portrait the qualities of vitality, character, expression, composition, light and shade—in fact a more realistic, because more



MARIE DE CLÈVES, PRINCESSE CONDÉ

BY F. CLOUET

SIR CHARLES LUCAS

BY JOHN HOSKINS

PHILIP, EARL OF PEMBROKE

BY JOHN HOSKINS

THOMAS RATCLIFFE,
EARL OF SUSSEX

BY NICHOLAS HILLIARD

ROBERT DEVEREUX, EARL OF ESSEX

BY JOHN BETTES

JOHN BETTES AND THOMAS BETTES

impressionistic interpretation, in place of a diagrammatic delineation.

One or two other names occur about this time of miniaturists as to whom little is known. John Shute we are quite ignorant of, and we know very little more of the two artists, John and Thomas Bettes. The former was an eminent miniature painter in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, by whom he was patronised and whose portrait he painted. He is supposed to have been a pupil of Hilliard. He died about the year 1570. His younger brother Thomas was also a miniature painter, as well as an illuminator. The Duke of Buccleuch possesses several examples of John Bettes's work, notably the portraits of Sir Francis Walsingham and Robert Devereux, Earl of Essex, both of which are very similar to the work of Hilliard. I give an illustration of the impetuous and hot-headed favourite of Queen Elizabeth's old age, who so often boldly remonstrated with his royal mistress, but was as often forgiven (Plate VI.). It is reported that Elizabeth on one occasion said of Essex, 'It were fitting some one should take him down and teach him better manners, or there was no rule with him.' On another occasion, when out of pique he turned his back upon her, the queen promptly gave him a box on the ears, at which, forgetting that she was a woman and a queen, he laid his hand on his sword and declared that 'he would not have taken such usage even from her father.' But the fondness Elizabeth had for the earl made her overlook his boisterous lack of manners, probably his well-known reckless bravery standing him in good stead. He, however, paid the penalty of his vanity and foolhardiness in trying to raise the Londoners in revolt, and was tried for high treason and condemned to death. He was only thirty-four when he was executed on Tower Hill in 1601.

There was in Dr. Propert's collection an example by Thomas Bettes, signed 'T. B.,' which is very rare, and represented John, first Earl of Bristol, 1586-1655. There

MINIATURES

is also an oil miniature of a gentleman attributed to the elder Bettes, in the Buccleuch collection.

Before considering the next English miniaturist, it is important to mention the Italian Zuccherò, who with Hilliard is supposed to have taught Isaac Oliver. Zuccherò was born at St. Angelo about 1543, and placed under his elder brother Taddeo, who took him to Rome in 1550 to study. He seems to have made very rapid progress, and at the end of six years was entrusted with important work and afterwards assisted in the decoration of the Palazzo Belvedere for Pius IV. What is of most interest to us is the fact that in 1574 he came to England and painted Queen Elizabeth and several other distinguished persons. He is chiefly known for his easel pictures, but miniatures by his hand are still preserved, notably the one of William Duckett, which is in oil on copper and belonged formerly to the Propert collection, and also the one of Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke, sister to Sir Philip Sidney, owned by the Earl of Derby. His influence on Isaac Oliver is more to be credited, because we can see in this painter's later work the first sign of breaking away from the old traditions, and an obvious attempt at giving light and shade to the miniature portrait.

We have now to review the work of the two Olivers, Isaac and his son Peter, whose names are inseparably connected with the great advance which they achieved in the art of portrait miniature. Isaac Oliver stands pre-eminent above all his predecessors and contemporaries; some writers even think he excels his successors, and this may be true in his quality of delicate finish.

Isaac was born in Leicestershire in 1556, and died at his house in Blackfriars, probably in 1617. He studied some time under Nicholas Hilliard, and later in life he was influenced much by Federigo Zuccherò, if he did not actually study under him. It is probably due to this influence, and the fact that he studied the works of the great Italian masters, making drawings and copies from

ISAAC OLIVER'S MINIATURES

them, that he gained that improved sense of quality and vigour over his master Hilliard in the painting and drawing of his faces and figures. This excellence is especially to be noted in his later work, in which we find exquisite elaboration and finish, together with great subtleness of tone, colour, and drawing, and a remarkable breadth and dignity of treatment. He was much more than a mere painter of frills and faces: he portrayed the character and dignity of his sitter, giving us a fine picture, painting and portrait at the same time, and withal possessing that definite charm of completeness and essential finish which is requisite to the perfect miniature.

It is curious that a painter of such genius, and a contemporary of Hilliard, should not have received a court appointment, though he was much patronised by his sovereign and the notable people of his time. Walpole thinks that the family was of French origin, as Isaac sometimes signs his name 'Olivier,' and the notes in his pocket-book, which has been preserved, are partly in French and partly in English; but he certainly wrote a treatise on 'limning' in English.

Isaac Oliver painted some very noble large miniatures, and there is existing in all the great collections a wonderful variety of his work.

In the royal collection at Windsor there are perhaps the finest examples of his larger miniatures. The magnificent portrait of Henry, Prince of Wales, which measures about $5\frac{1}{4}$ by 4 inches, is the largest and finest portrait painted of that prince. It represents him in a laced ruff and gilded armour, with a curtain background, through which we see soldiers and tents. It is hardly possible to overpraise the combined delicacy and breadth of this admirable portrait. Of an earlier date than this one is the beautiful full-length portrait of Sir Philip Sidney, seated under a tree. This portrait is a magnificent piece of composition: it is natural and unaffected in pose, excellent in drawing, and marvellous

MINIATURES

in its truthful elaboration of detail. The straight lines of the architectural background in the distance contrast most interestingly with the diagonal inclination of the figure and long rapier sword. The aërial perspective is tenderly felt, and the colour scheme is fresh and simple.

Another portrait of Sir Philip Sidney by Isaac Oliver is in the possession of Sir Charles Dilke. This is a small oval in a very fine silver filigree frame. It is an excellent example of the artist's work, pure in colour, tender in drawing and modelling, and represents the poet younger than in the first miniature, with auburn hair, white square collar, and black doublet, and it has a very solid pure blue background.

The Montagu House collection contains another one, rather similar, of about the same size, but it has a claret-coloured tunic. This last-named collection contains many more of Isaac Oliver's, including the rather unusual one of Queen Elizabeth, who is represented in a many-coloured dress of red, green, gold, and blue, with a lace veil hanging from a coronet head-dress of pearls. The face is of the usual colourless complexion, with dark eyes, and the background is of a sad, sober grey (Plate VII.). Perhaps the most notable and typical example of all is the miniature of the Countess of Essex, and this suggests the work of Hilliard carried to far greater excellence, inasmuch as the lace ruff and the bodice are more perfect in their delicacy, and the painting of the hair and the drawing of the face have more quality than is found in the earlier painter's rendering of ladies' portraits.

I must also mention several examples of Isaac Oliver's work in the collection of Major-General Sotheby. That of Anne of Denmark is perhaps the most noticeable, and although only a small oval miniature of two inches, it is very beautiful in drawing, especially in the rendering of the right hand resting on her breast, and the lovely detail of the costume and jewels is rendered in quite the most delicate manner possible (Plate VII.).

It may not be amiss to recall here an historical



Queen Elizabeth
BY ISAAC OLIVER

Anne of Denmark
BY ISAAC OLIVER

Countess of Essex
BY ISAAC OLIVER

Lady Mary, Duchess of Carlisle
BY ISAAC OLIVER

ISAAC OLIVER'S QUALITIES

tradition about this Danish princess. As every one knows, she was the daughter of King Frederick II. of Denmark and Norway, and was married to James VI. of Scotland by proxy at Copenhagen, August 20, 1589. On the voyage homeward to Scotland they encountered tempestuous winds which drove them on to the coast of Norway. The bride's own ship was missing for three nights, and in a most perilous condition before it was found by the ambassador's ship. Meanwhile James was impatiently awaiting their arrival in Scotland, where the weather was also very stormy. The Chancellor Maitland, whom the king charged with having caused the untoward delay, suggested to him the adventurous project of putting to sea himself to bring his bride home. James resolved, in Burton's words, 'to have one romance in his life,' and sailed from Leith, October 22nd, on his chivalrous errand, accompanied by his chancellor, Maitland. On the 28th he landed at Slaikray, on the coast of Norway, and thence proceeded to Upslo, where Queen Anne was waiting. At their meeting, which took place on November 19th, 'his majestie myndit to give the queine a kiss after the Scotis faschioun, quhilk she refusit, as not being the forme of her cuntrie. Efter a few wordis prively spoken betuix his majestie and her, thair past familiaritie and kisses.'

Lucy Hay, Countess of Carlisle, is another fine example of Isaac Oliver's earlier manner, and belongs to the same collection (Plate VII.). There are several other, perhaps equally typical, examples, including portraits of the Countess of Essex (Plate VII.), Mrs. Holland, Sir Philip Wenman, and others. I must not forget to include the magnificent example at South Kensington of Richard Sackville, Earl of Dorset. This is a full-length figure, and is without doubt a *tour de force* in its finish and detail. It is signed and dated 1616, so represents one of the latest works by this master. Unfortunately the head is somewhat faded in colour, but the drawing and character are unmistakably fine, and as for the costume

MINIATURES

and accessories, I cannot imagine elaboration carried to a further pitch of microscopic minuteness. It is an illumination in the strictest sense of the word, and the portrait is lost in a maze of intricate ornament and pattern.

The miniature art of Isaac Oliver is certainly of the same school as Hilliard, but it is marked by a much more faithful interpretation of nature, and though equal in delicacy of detail, it contains at its best more vigour and character in the drawing and a finer quality of flesh-colour and modelling. The pupil was also much more varied in his treatment, and besides producing many excellent small copies of the old masters, he painted several large full-length miniatures, showing much skill in design and drawing; and one of his most remarkable works is the group of Lord Montacute and his brother. He also occasionally painted sacred and historical subjects, one of his finest being an Entombment.

Isaac Oliver may be said to have carried the art of miniature portraiture several degrees beyond what had been done previously, and his later work clearly shows the influence of a wider inspiration than that of the illuminator's art. At the same time, we still recognise the flat decorative traditions of the manuscript miniatures, leaving nothing to the imagination, and giving us no mystery or picturesqueness of effect, except what was inherent in the costume of the period.

In the miniatures of this school, every detail of the picture is in an equal blaze of light, and every point of detail is in equal focus. Whether it be a curtain or a carpet, armour, embroidery, lace, or jewels, each and all are carried to the highest pitch of elaboration. All that the eye can see is here reproduced, and often a great deal which the eye would not see—except with infinite effort.

Peter Oliver was the eldest son of Isaac Oliver, and was born in London in 1601 and died in 1647. He was instructed in miniature painting by his father, but he did not confine his talents to portraiture, for we know that

PETER OLIVER

Charles I. employed him to copy in water-colours many of his finest pictures in the magnificent collection at Whitehall. This king possessed a true appreciation and love of the arts, and these copies in miniature were made in order that he might have the pleasure of looking at them when away from the originals in his own galleries. It appears by the catalogues of Charles I. and James II. that there were thirteen historical miniatures by Peter Oliver in the royal collection. Peter also painted innumerable portraits for this munificent royal patron of the arts, and there are many examples of his work extant in all the principal collections. They include several excellent miniatures of Frederick of Bohemia; Elizabeth of Bohemia; Charles Louis, Count Palatine; Lady Arabella Stuart (Plate VIII.); Francis Bacon; and portraits of himself and many others. The portrait of Charles Louis, Count Palatine, at Montagu House, shows us a style which suggests the work of Hoskins, his successor, rather than Hilliard, his predecessor (Plate VIII.). It is fuller in tone and modelling and less hard in drawing. The miniature of Charles I. as Prince of Wales, at Windsor, is a very fine example of this painter's work, being full of character, expression, and finely modelled drawing.

The most perfect miniature in the world, according to Walpole, was the portrait by Peter Oliver of Lady Lucy Percy, mother of the beautiful Lady Venetia Digby. It was bought at great price by the owner of Strawberry Hill and very highly valued by him. At the great sale of the Strawberry Hill collections this famous miniature was bought by Robert Holford, Esq., for one hundred guineas. Another example which was bought by Walpole at great price is now in Sir Charles Dilke's collection, and represents a son of Sir Kenelm Digby. Then there is the famous copy of Vandyck's portrait of Sir Kenelm, with his wife and two sons, together with many miniatures of the Digby family, which were discovered in an old mansion in Wales belonging to the Digbys. The

MINIATURES

miniature of Sir Kenelm Digby which I illustrate (Plate VIII.) is from Major-General Sotheby's collection, also the one in colour of the Elector Palatine on Plate XIII.; and the small one of Charles II. is the property of Sir Tollemache Sinclair (Plate VIII.). It is worthy of remembrance that it was Sir Kenelm Digby whom Charles I. employed as an emissary to prevail on Vandyck to renew his visit to England after having departed with so little satisfaction at his first short stay here.

Bryan says that 'one of the younger Oliver's finest portraits is a picture of his wife which was in the collection of the Duchess of Portland; it is doubted whether his father ever surpassed this excellent miniature.'

Peter Oliver also executed some fine drawings in Indian ink. It has been suggested that many miniatures by the two Olivers, belonging to Sir Andrew Fountaine, were lost by a fire at White's old Chocolate House in St. James's Street about 1758, as it is known that many examples of the art perished then. Whether this is so or not, there are still extant a considerable number by both father and son in many of the great homes of England.

The art of the two Olivers is always associated with that of Hilliard, and the three undoubtedly represent the first epoch of portrait miniature painting of the English school; but whereas the earlier painter was more essentially a craftsman, the two latter showed much greater virility of expression and insight into character. Their force and vigour was not gained at the expense of either delicacy or finish, and, as we have seen, Isaac Oliver could surpass his master in these qualities. Peter Oliver, in many of his miniatures, shows an even greater solidity of modelling and painting in the heads than his father, and though it is a generally accepted fact that he rarely equalled Isaac's best work, I am inclined to think that in the more painter-like qualities he sometimes surpassed him. It is not surprising that we see foreshadowed in a few examples of the son's miniatures the qualities which his immediate successors, under the influence of Vandyck,



LADY ARABELLA STUART

BY PETER OLIVER
(Signed)

PETER OLIVER
BY HIMSELF

CHARLES II
BY PETER OLIVER

CHARLES LOUIS, COUNT PALATINE
BY PETER OLIVER

SIR KENELM DIGBY
BY PETER OLIVER
(Signed, 1619)

CORNELIUS JANSEN

brought to such perfection. We may now be said to be passing away for all time from the traditions created by the manuscript illuminations. It was no longer sufficient merely to represent the decorative aspect of a human face, however excellent the delineation of the features or subtle the modelling; other qualities were to claim equal attention.

I have still to add two more names to the list of distinguished Dutch painters who came to England and practised the art of miniature. Cornelius Jansen was born about 1590 and died about 1665. He was an oil portrait-painter, but copied his larger pictures in miniature. One of the best known small portraits by Jansen is in the Jones collection at South Kensington, and is of John Pym, the Republican. It is on a panel measuring 8 inches by 7, and is excellent in its qualities of painting and drawing, being both fresh in colour and free in execution. I have seen many small oil miniatures that are attributed to Jansen, and give an illustration of one belonging to Major-General Sotheby (Plate xv.). It is considered to be a portrait of Sir Nicholas Crispe. Another, illustrated here, is from a portrait in the possession of the Duke of Portland, and is called a likeness of the artist, but is almost certainly not so (Plate xv.). Both these are reproduced the same size as the originals, and from them it can be seen that Jansen's method of work was painter-like and strong, though on so small a scale. He, like Samuel Cooper, who was his contemporary, made good use of shadows to define the form, and his flesh-colour was rich and low in tone, whilst his painting of details in the costume was in every way excellent. Jansen is supposed to have arrived in this country in the year 1618, when he was soon taken into the service of James I., whose portrait he painted several times. One of the finest portraits painted by this artist was of Sir George Villiers, father of the Duke of Buckingham. There is also a portrait of Charles I. at Chatsworth, one of Henry, Prince of Wales,

MINIATURES

at Kedleston Hall, and one of the Duke of Buckingham at Welbeck Abbey. But of all the examples of portraiture by Jansen in this country, the one of John Milton is the most famous. It was painted in the first year of the artist's visit to this country, and when Milton was only ten years old. It formerly belonged to Thomas Holles, and there exists an engraving of the picture by Cipriani.

These larger portraits were usually painted on panel, but the miniatures we have before mentioned were executed on copper, and can claim to possess all the qualities of the larger ones.

Sir Balthasar Gerbier, Baron d'Ouvilly, was born at Middelburg in 1592, and came to England as a retainer of the famous Duke of Buckingham in 1613. After his introduction to the English court he appears to have been employed by Charles I. as a diplomatic envoy. Among the Harleian MSS. is a curious letter written to the Duke of Buckingham by the Duchess, when the former was in Spain with Prince Charles and Gerbier on an errand of intrigue, in which she says: 'I pray you, if you have idle time, sit to Gerbier for your picture, that I may have it well done in little.' There is a large oval miniature of the Duke of Buckingham on horseback in the possession of the Duchess of Northumberland; it is signed B. Gerbier, 1618.

In a letter dated 1628 it is said 'that the King and Queen were entertained at supper at Gerbier's, the Duke's painter's house, which could not stand him in less than one thousand pounds.' After the death of Buckingham, Gerbier rose in royal favour. He was knighted at Hampton Court, and was made Surveyor-General of the works in succession to Inigo Jones. Soon after he seems to have left England. During the Commonwealth he returned to this country, and it is said that the triumphal arches erected for the reception of Charles II. were designed by him. He died in 1667. In the Jones collection at South Kensington there is

SIR ROBERT PEAKE AND HIS PUPILS

a miniature of Prince Charles, signed and dated 1616. It is executed in a sepia-coloured ink, and shows the prince with short hair, without moustache or beard, and wearing earrings. It is an oval medallion surrounded by a decoration in the style of the Italian Renaissance, with the royal arms at the base.

Sir Robert Peake, an English painter and engraver, who was born about 1590 and died in 1667, is said to have received payment from the Council of State as early as 1612 for 'limnings.'

Peake was in favour with the royal family, and painted and engraved portraits of James I. and Charles I. Bryan tells us that he fought on the side of the Cavaliers, and was knighted by Charles at Oxford in 1645.

Amongst Peake's pupils were Faithorne and Dobson, neither of whom is well known. I have, however, seen a really charming miniature which is attributed to William Faithorne, at Montagu House. It is a large square miniature, and a full-length portrait of Barbara Villiers, Duchess of Cleveland. She is represented in a graceful pose leaning on her right arm, and dressed in a white satin dress, which is most exquisitely painted. In the background is a rich brown curtain against which the pearly flesh-tints and dark hair relieve with a subtle harmony. This is the finest work of this painter known to exist.

CHAPTER V

THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ENGLISH MINIATURISTS
—JOHN HOSKINS, SAMUEL COOPER, THOMAS FLAT-
MAN, NATHANIEL DIXON, AND THEIR CONTEM-
PORARIES—MINIATURES IN PLUMBAGO.

THE seventeenth century represents the greatest epoch in the English art of portrait miniature, and during this period the name of one master stands paramount above all others. He excelled all his predecessors, and has never been equalled by any miniaturist since, far less surpassed. In fact, it is hardly too much to say that Samuel Cooper's art contains the finest qualities possible in the miniature portrait: character, expression, breadth, vigour, and solidity, combined with masterly balance of light and shade, simplicity and dignity of colour, and withal a grace and nobility of treatment which more than counterbalance the lack of minute finish, for which he has sometimes been disadvantageously compared with Isaac Oliver.

I must preface my consideration of Cooper's work with an account of his uncle and master, John Hoskins, whose miniatures at their best foreshadow in no small degree many of the qualities possessed by the nephew. Of the life of John Hoskins there is very little known. He lived in the reign of Charles I., and died in 1664. Graham, when commenting on him, says that 'he was bred a face painter in oil, but afterwards taking to miniature, far excelled what he did before,' that 'he drew King Charles, his Queen, and most of their court, and had two considerable disciples, Alexander and Samuel Cooper,



JOHN HOSKINS
(Signed)

ALGERNON SIDNEY
(Signed, 1632)

MARY, PRINCESS OF ORANGE
(Signed, 1644)
BY JOHN HOSKINS

JOHN HOSKINS

the latter of whom became much the most eminent limner.' There is no doubt that though his reputation has been overshadowed by his distinguished nephew, John Hoskins was a miniature painter of very great merit. He was accustomed to sign his miniatures J. H., of which there are a good many extant, notably those belonging to the Dukes of Buccleuch and Devonshire, the Earl of Derby, Major-General Sotheby, Mr. Jeffery Whitehead, and others. The Montagu House collection is particularly rich in the number and quality of its examples of this master, and to see them is at once to realise his true worth. His drawing is always excellent, and his colour, where not faded, good and sober in tone, the modelling of the faces being also well rendered. There are apparent in Hoskins's work many of the qualities which his pupil carried to greater perfection. In the portrait of Algernon Sidney, we see the uncle quite at his best, and this miniature might worthily be mistaken for a Cooper. The handsome, clean-cut features are painted with all the skill and distinction of the nephew, and the scheme of colour is identical with the later painter. The dark flowing hair, black doublet slashed with white, and the rich blue in the sky, make a harmony which is dignified, simple, and entirely satisfying (Plate ix.). It is possible that this example was painted under the strong influence of his pupil's work, as it is easy to believe that later in life the pupil became master and the master pupil, and this would account for the inequality of much of this artist's work.

When looking at this miniature it is interesting to recall the fact that the unfortunate Algernon Sidney was a martyr to his own sincerity of character, and, being accused of implication in the Rye House Plot, suffered execution on Tower Hill. He was earlier in life one of the most energetic of the Parliamentary cavalry officers, and was appointed one of the commissioners for the trial of Charles I., but took no part in the actual trial, nor did he sign the death-warrant. His own account of the

MINIATURES

matter shows that he had the moral courage to oppose Cromwell, Bradshaw, and others, giving as his reasons why the trial should not go on—'Firstly, the king could be tried by no court; secondly, that no man could be tried by that court.' This being alleged in vain, and Cromwell using these formal words, 'I tell you we will cut off his head with the crown upon it,' Sidney replied, 'You may take your own course, I cannot stop you; but I will keep myself clean from having any hand in the business,' and he immediately went out of the room and never returned. This temerity was the keynote to his character; and Burnet's account of Algernon Sidney correctly describes him: 'A man of most extraordinary courage; a steady man, even to obstinacy; sincere, but of a rough and boisterous temper that could not bear contradiction.'

Hoskins's rendering of ladies' portraits is graceful and refined, and the colour of the flesh, though in many instances faded, is subtle and pale in the lights, whilst having a tendency to brownness in the shadows. The portrait of the Princess Mary of Orange is a very good example, with dark flowing curls, pale complexion and dark eyes, with a faint shadow on one side of the face, which looks to the right. In this miniature the harmony of the brown and blue is maintained, the low-cut dress being blue, trimmed with pearls, and the background is a sober brown. We here have also an excellently drawn right hand raised to the left breast (Plate ix.). In this same collection is a miniature of a lady, after Vandyck, which was painted in the year 1644, showing that Hoskins, like Cooper, was influenced by studying the great Dutch painter. The most noteworthy example of Hoskins's work that I have seen in other collections is the portrait of Sir E. Godfrey, painted in 1663, so that it is one of the latest miniatures which the artist executed (Plate x.). It belongs to Major-General Sotheby, and is a magnificent example, full of character, fine in colour, broad in effect and good in design. The costume is



JAMES, DUKE OF YORK

BY SAMUEL COOPER

(Signed 1651)

SIR EDMONDBURY GODFREY

BY JOHN HOSKINS

(Signed 1653)

SAMUEL COOPER

especially well painted, the white collar being most exquisitely rendered in its detail and tone, and the face, though much stippled, is very finely drawn, with the forms and planes deftly expressed. The expression of the face is lifelike, and the hair in the excellence of its treatment comes very near to the work of Cooper.

Sir Edmondbury Godfrey was a woolmonger, an influential man and a Justice of the Peace for Westminster. His strenuous efforts to maintain order and relieve distress during the plague of London obtained him his knighthood; but his end was miserable and a mystery. He was found in a ditch on the south side of Primrose Hill, face downwards, and transfixed by his own sword. It was undoubtedly murder, and probably the work of Titus Oates and his desperate gang, to give colour to their false allegations and excite popular opinion in favour of their agitation against the Catholics. Godfrey was a good Protestant and a very fair-minded man, and Burnet says, 'Few men lived on better terms with the Papists than he did.'

Enough has been said about existing specimens of this painter's art, which are all signed and dated, to show that, though he had so distinguished a nephew, he himself deserves to rank with the greatest exponents of miniature painting. His treatment in the light and shade, force and character of his heads, is in distinct advance of the Olivers. In chiaroscuro and general effect he attempted qualities which his predecessors were content to leave alone, and though in some of his work we can see an evident indecision of technique and touch, and a too obvious display of stipple, his best examples show a fine definition of character, and a fuller and more painter-like expression of form—qualities which foreshadowed the greatness of the artist whose work I shall now consider.

To Samuel Cooper must be given the proud position of supremacy in his art. The velvety breadth of Holbein's decorative miniatures, the delicate finesse of

MINIATURES

Hilliard's, or the subtle definition of Isaac Oliver's small portraits, pale before the nobler and more masterly qualities of this artist. Cooper has been most correctly described as the English Vandyck; and we must not forget that this great Dutch painter came to England in 1632, at the invitation of Charles I., and his arrival really altered the whole character of English portraiture, and undoubtedly Vandyck's art exercised a great influence on that of Samuel Cooper.

It has been suggested that Cooper owes everything to the influence of Vandyck. Certainly this painter's beautiful rendering of the graceful fashions of the time, and his wonderful powers of painting, made him the presiding genius of portraiture. Mr. Wornum says that Vandyck was in London in 1621, working for James I., and this is borne out by an order on the English Exchequer to pay 'Anthony Vandike the sum of one hundred pounds by way of reward for especial services by him performed for his Matie.' Also on the 28th of the same month there was a pass issued to enable 'Anthonie Van Dyck to travaile for eight months,' and this looks as though he were in the regular pay of the Crown. With reference to the miniatures which have been attributed to Vandyck, there are three or four specimens shown at South Kensington, and Walpole mentions an oil miniature portrait of him done by his own hand; also Dr. Propert had a portrait of Henrietta Maria which he considered as undoubtedly by him.

The Earl of Yarborough possesses the full-length miniature of Philip Herbert, fourth Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery. In all these we may discover the truth of the remark that in painting miniatures Vandyck did but condense his greater knowledge.

If there is any proof necessary that Cooper studied Vandyck, we have only to look at the lovely copies which this miniaturist made from some of the Dutchman's famous pictures. In the Buccleuch collection there are several such copies, most notable among them being

COOPER'S PORTRAITS OF CROMWELL

the large miniature, 9 inches by 7, of the children of Charles I., which is a very beautiful harmony of soft browns and greys, with a note of blue in the dress of the eldest princess; and the even larger and finer copy of Vandyck's portrait of William, Duke of Newcastle. It is a full-length, full-face representation of the duke, and every detail of the picture is as masterly as the original.

The earliest dated miniature on record by Cooper is 1643, and as he was born in 1609, this would make him thirty-four years of age when it was painted. He is said to have resided in France and Holland before settling in this country, and Lord Orford credits him with having painted several pictures for the court of France, for which his widow received a pension during her life. It would be of considerable interest to see the earlier examples of this artist's work before he came under the influence of Vandyck, but unfortunately they are not known to exist. There is a tradition that Cooper painted for Louis XIV. larger portraits than those he painted in England.

Samuel had an elder brother Alexander, who also studied under their uncle Hoskins, but he went abroad early in life, and lived in Amsterdam some years, finally entering the service of Queen Christina of Sweden, nothing more being known of him.


Samuel Cooper died in London in 1672, and was buried in Old St. Pancras Church. During his career he painted most of the illustrious men of his time, and his name is as closely connected with the portraits of Oliver Cromwell as Holbein's was with those of Henry VIII. Few collectors who possess a miniature of the great Puritan care to admit that there is any doubt about its being from the hand of Cooper. His art without question belongs to the Commonwealth rather than to the reign of Charles I., and from the number of existing examples he must have painted and drawn the Protector many times.

The finest portrait of the Puritan that exists is in

MINIATURES

the Buccleuch collection, and is the famous unfinished miniature which tradition says Cooper was caught in the act of copying from a completed one that he had already painted from life. It is said that Cromwell consented to sit only on the condition that there should be no repetition of the portrait, and when he made the discovery of this violation of the conditions, he took possession of both miniatures, saying, 'Ho! Ho! Master Cooper, none of that, sir.'

These two miniatures descended to Lady Falconberg, and finally came to the present collection of the Duke of Buccleuch. The finished one is an oval of $4\frac{1}{4}$ inches, and represents the Protector turned three-quarter face to the left, in armour, with a white falling collar. It is magnificently drawn and painted in solid colour, but is yellowish in its flesh-tints, with a dull brown background, whereas the unfinished one, as our illustration shows (Plate XI.), is an oval of $3\frac{1}{2}$ inches, and is only finished in the head, with a square patch of dark background round it, the rest being sketched in. The head, however, which is $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches and a replica of the first, is in every way finer, both in colour and painting, and as an example of character portraiture it would be very difficult to imagine anything more perfect. Cooper, in the painting of this head, surpassed even himself, and certainly never achieved a more powerful piece of character painting. The more we study this miniature, the more convincingly real the whole character of Cromwell becomes. To be guilty of a paradox, I might say that this portrait is more convincing than nature herself. The portrait gives us only those essentials of the man's character which are best worth immortalising; whilst nature, without selection, shows us the great and the trivial in discordant juxtaposition. In the same case are two other interesting portraits, which are illustrated on the same Plate, one of Cromwell's wife and the other of his daughter, Mrs. Claypole, both being typical examples of the artist's work.



M^{rs}. Claypole, Cromwell's daughter.



Oliver Cromwell's wife.

COOPER'S QUALITY OF RETICENCE

There are also to be seen here, amongst many other beautiful specimens of the master's art, portraits of John Milton, Charles II., James II., Richard and Henry Cromwell, John Thurloe, James, Duke of York, Sir Robert Gayer, and others.

The miniature of John Milton is a delightful one. It is an oval of two inches and gives us the poet nearly full face, showing to perfection the beautiful mouth and chin. The flesh-colour is rich and fine in tone, relieved against the warm brown hair. He wears a deep falling white collar over a black doublet, and the background is of a dark, colourless grey. So we may see that the distinction which the miniature possesses is dependent solely on its masterly painting and vigorous drawing, its dignified reticence of expression and its fine balance of tone and light and shade.

It may be said of all Cooper's miniatures, that he possesses the quality of reticence to perfection—reticence of colour, of expression, and of tone. His colour harmony varies from soft dull browns to silvery greys, and from greys to pure blues and purples. Within this scale we have either the pale complexion of his women's portraits, or the rich and sometimes hot complexion of his men's. Sometimes a richer note of colour is introduced by a subdued russet yellow shawl or scarf. His backgrounds are often only a sad grey or brown, though at times he will introduce on one side of the head a deep blue sky; at other times the whole background may be a sky of low-tone blues and greys.

A peculiarity of Cooper's work is the fact that many of his finest portraits are mere sketches, as far as the figure is concerned. It is as if he had put all his inspiration and energy into the delineation of the portraiture, and cared little how his sitters were dressed, the real reason being probably that the limited number of the sittings only enabled him to do justice to the head. Two of the most striking examples of this are at Windsor Castle. One is a portrait of James, Duke of Monmouth,

MINIATURES

which is as fine a rendering of this fascinating youth as we could well imagine; and the other is a strong and vigorous painting of George Monk, Duke of Albemarle. The contrast between these two portraits is a study in itself; the former giving us with consummate art the insinuating subtleness and charm of the sitter, and the latter portraying in every brush-stroke the strong man of action. We can also see in these two, better than in any others perhaps, the beautiful treatment of the hair for which Cooper is so famous. There is another very powerful portrait at Windsor which is quite unpromising in its fidelity to ugliness. Its very realism commands our interest and admiration, and in looking at it we seem to be transported into the presence of Charles II. himself. It is a large head turned to the left, painted into an octagonal frame: the immense wig of hair and the broad, square lace collar fit the frame with a great sense of dignity and decoration, and it is finished with a masterly sense of balance in every detail. There are some good miniatures of this monarch in other collections, but none of them are equal to this.

In referring to the unfinished miniatures by Cooper, I may mention the interesting examples, now at South Kensington, which formerly belonged to Mr. Edwin H. Lawrence. In these we have a most useful and inspiring series, showing the various stages of work from the first limning to the finished portrait. They are fifteen in number, fourteen of which were originally contained in a red leather pocket-book belonging to Cooper, which is an excellent example of contemporary binder's art, with rich tooling in gold and a silver clasp.

If we study these various stages carefully, we find that Cooper commenced by drawing the head and figure with a delicate outline of sepia or warm brown, then painting in the shadows with transparent sienna, and the half-tones with a pure grey blue. In the case of a lady's portrait the shadows are kept cooler and the half-tones bluer, but in the men's we find in the earlier stages the

COOPER'S METHODS OF PAINTING

shadows are often very hot in colour, with but very little greyneſs at all. This hotneſs of the ſhadows is very often a characteristic of his finiſhed male portraits. The colour is diſtinctly ſtippled, not waſhed on, and the backgrounds are painted opaquely with a diagonal touch from right to left downwards. In the one of Mrs. Price Phillips, we are ſtruck by the delightful refinement of the drawing in this initial ſtage and the feeling way in which the hair is painted, ſhowing a moſt ſenſitive appreciation of form, line, and breadth of tone. It is very frequently aſſerted that Cooper and his ſchool—in fact all miniaturiſts who painted on vellum—uſed ſolid opaque colours; but this is only partially true. Certainly Cooper's fleſh-tints were nearly always transparent, though ſometimes they were painted on a ground of white, and occaſionally, as in one of the portraits of Cromwell already mentioned, he has painted the fleſh in opaque colours.

To any one who is uſed to the manipulation of water-colours, it is at once quite obvious that the qualities of fleſh-colour achieved by Samuel Cooper would be quite impoſſible in an opaque method of work. At his beſt he is rich, luminous, and full of that transparent quality which all colouriſts admire and ſtrive to attain, as the eſſential character of good fleſh-painting. It has been only given to the very few greateſt colouriſts to attain what has been termed the 'infinite' quality—the quality which palpitates with life, and which is achieved only by the unique combination of the moſt ſenſitive eye, the moſt inſiſtent reſerve in the colour, and the moſt ſkilful and reſtrained technique, and although ſo much cannot be claimed for Cooper's colour, it is certainly not 'dead,' but luminous and direct.

What is eſpecially to be noticed in ſtudying the work of this painter is his grasp of the eſſential variations in the complexions of his ſitters. Many famous portrait-painters have allowed their ſkill to dull their ſenſitivenneſs for colour, and have become, as it were,

MINIATURES

merely skilled painters of flesh under a given recipe of colour; but this is not so with Cooper—he never bound himself down to a recipe. His palette was determined by the characteristics and personal qualities suggested by his sitter. Hence we see that hardly any two portraits have the same complexion, which is made as much a personal possession as the contour of their features or the tone of their hair. Another peculiarity worthy of remark is Cooper's prevailing habit of keeping all whites in the portrait very low in tone and very grey. This adds great force to the flesh-colour.

There are some excellent Coopers in Major-General Sotheby's collection. They include portraits of the Duke of York, afterwards James II.; Charles II.; Bishop Juxon (unfinished); John Selden; Noah Bridges, and several others. Of these, the one of the Duke of York is undoubtedly the best and most interesting. The distinguished face and long brown hair are full of quality and fine drawing. The broad collar falling over a grey and yellow doublet, with a blue sash across, are relieved against a cloudy background. So magnificent is the original miniature, that in spite of the necessary shortcomings of a reproduction, one can obtain a fair idea of its beauty from the illustration (Plate x.). There are so many fine examples of Cooper's work extant that it is difficult to give the palm to any particular one; but of this we can say with perfect truth, that it yields to none and surpasses all but one or two in its qualities of completeness and mastery of tone values. It is indeed a Vandyck 'in little.' The Baroness Burdett-Coutts owns a small enamel of $1\frac{3}{4}$ inches, a copy of this miniature by Petitot, but it loses much in quality of colour and from the fact that it shows less of the figure.

The ladies' portraits which Cooper painted are worthy of especial notice, because although few painters of any period have been able to portray the masculine countenance with greater vigour and life, he was equally well able to express the subtle charm and refinement of the



Colonel Sidney Stewart, Lord Rumney.
SIGNED 1668

John, Earl of Clare.
SIGNED 1656

La Belle Stuart, Frances Duchess of Richmond.
SIGNED 1655.

FRANCES, DUCHESS OF RICHMOND

feminine face. It is unfortunate that many of the existing ladies' portraits are faded in the carnations, but we have many which still possess their original freshness of colour, and these convey to us the full beauty of his work. We can hardly imagine a more charming portrait than the one of Frances, Duchess of Richmond, 'La Belle Stuart,' signed and dated 1655 (Plate XII.). It is an oval miniature of about three inches, and is a little unusual in its colour scheme, having a red curtain in the background and a blue sky, and the low-cut bodice is yellow. This harmony is most deftly treated, and the drawing is most refined and skilful. We can see in the rendering of the face all the charm and simplicity that characterised the original. History tells us that she came to England in 1663 with a letter of introduction to the restored monarch, and was appointed maid-of-honour to Queen Catherine. Tradition says that Charles first noticed her while she was asleep in Lady Castlemaine's apartment, and Pepys noted that the king 'will be with her half an hour together kissing her.' She appeared to Pepys the greatest beauty he had ever seen. The French ambassador was amazed at the artlessness of her prattle to the king, and her character was summarised by Hamilton thus: 'It was hardly possible for a woman to have less art and more beauty.' Her numerous admirers found this simplicity more than a match for their artifices, and she is even said to have exasperated Charles by her obduracy; but it is chronicled that the honour of being the first lady at court to drive in a *calèche*, newly arrived from Paris, overcame her scruples. Even Queen Catherine looked favourably on her, for it was her intervention that obtained her return to court and royal favour after her elopement with her cousin, the third Duke of Richmond.

As a distinct contrast to this miniature there is the portrait of the Countess of Derby, who is of Dutch-like proportions and full of character. Then, again, there are the lovely miniatures of Elizabeth, Countess of South-

MINIATURES

ampton, of Lady Heyden, from the Strawberry Hill collection, of Frances Ward, Baroness Dudley, and others, all of which belong to the Duke of Buccleuch.

In other collections we have a beautiful one of Lucy Percy, Countess of Carlisle, in a harmony of blue and grey, with very pale flesh-colour (Plate XIII.); and Anne Hyde, Duchess of York; both belonging to Major-General Sotheby. Also at Devonshire House there are miniatures of Elizabeth Claypole, favourite daughter of Oliver Cromwell, and Elizabeth Cecil, Countess of Devonshire, both of which are noteworthy and characteristic. In some we notice the stipple more than in others, which, I believe, is due in a great measure to the fading of certain pigments, but in all we notice the proverbial beauty of the rendering of the hair.

Cooper's individual scheme of colour had a most powerful influence on his contemporaries and immediate successors in the art, and this is very noticeable in a case of miniatures, which contains about three dozen specimens of the work of Cooper, Nathaniel Dixon, and Laurence Crosse and others, at Montagu House. These are so similar in treatment, especially as to colour, that judging from a cursory glance they might have been painted by one hand.

When comparing the art of Samuel Cooper with that of his predecessors, we have to bear in mind many important considerations which influenced the portraiture of the seventeenth century in England.

We have already seen in the work of Isaac Oliver and his son Peter Oliver, who was in reality a contemporary of Cooper's, the first dawn of a new tendency—that is, to give light and shade and chiaroscuro to miniature portraits in contradistinction to the hitherto flat, hard, and unatmospheric treatment which had its birth in the Flemish school.

This innovation, or development, was but a latter-day reflection of the Italian Renaissance of painting, and when Anthony Vandyck came to England early in the

THE CHANGE IN FASHIONS

century, he completely revolutionised the manners and methods of English artists. This emancipation from the older traditions was all the more complete, because the fashions of the time lent themselves to a freer handling and a more picturesque *ensemble*.

I might assert with perfect truth that the archaic Flemish decorative manner of painting went out of fashion with the stiff ruff and farthingale. Under the example and enlightenment of the court of Charles I., a new life and stimulus was given to art in all its branches. The fashions of dress and of wearing the hair completely changed from the quaint, stiff costumes and head-dresses of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, to a graceful, loose, and picturesque mode. The earlier manner of dressing the hair either entirely hid that crowning beauty of woman, or made it conform to some fantastic shape which destroyed its natural charm, although it was no doubt harmonious with the stiff ruff or collar.

In Charles I.'s reign we see all this reversed. The ladies of his court followed the fashion introduced by Henrietta Maria from the court of Henry IV., and treated their natural and feminine ornament in a graceful way. The dresses, too, lost their stiff, symmetrical regularity of outline and design; the collar disappeared in favour of low-cut bodices, showing that most beautiful of contours in a woman, the neck and shoulders, on which depends the graceful carriage of the head. In the men's attire we see much the same changes, and though the long hair and wigs so prevalent with the Royalist dandies may be considered effeminate, we must admit them to have been a most becoming setting to the face, and in complete harmony with their lace, ribbons, spangles, and slashed silken tunics. Artists gladly took advantage of all these new vanities, and the genius of Vandyck seized and emphasised them in the most masterly and picturesque manner.

The mysterious knowledge of composition and light and shade which he possessed, and the dexterity and

MINIATURES

precision with which he expressed himself, gave an added charm and dignity to his men and women. It is small wonder, therefore, that his portraits came as a revelation to both painters and patrons, and created an absolutely new school of portraiture.

Of this school Samuel Cooper was the leading and most brilliant English painter, and his miniatures, within their limitations, lack none of the romantic charm or dignity of Vandyck's large portraits, and show besides an equal breadth and vigour of handling.

I have already referred to the oft-repeated accusation that Cooper lacked the power of high finish. I would refer those who are inclined to agree with this opinion to the portraits of James, Duke of York, John, Earl of Clare, or Colonel Sidney, all of which are illustrated here (Plates x. and xii.). Also at the South Kensington Museum may be seen the very small miniature of Prince Rupert, in which is combined the most remarkable delicacy of drawing with the most lifelike expression and the most masterly treatment of the accessories. It may not be considered minute in its detail, like a Hilliard or Isaac Oliver, but it possesses within its small compass all the essential finish requisite to the fine miniature portrait.

To give Walpole's much quoted eulogy of this painter:—'If a glass could expand Cooper's pictures to the size of Vandyck's they would appear to have been painted to that proportion. If his portrait of Cromwell could be so enlarged, I do not know but Vandyck would appear less great by comparison.'

To any one who studies the development in the art of the miniature portrait, it will be obvious at once where Cooper is essentially greater than all other miniaturists. If genius is the possession of a highly developed individualism, if it is something more than an unusual capacity for taking pains, if it infers a clearer vision, a greater insight into the essentialities of art, then Cooper possessed all these qualifications; but he possessed also, what is of even greater import to the



DUCHESS OF PORTSMOUTH

BY NATHANIEL DIXON
(Signed)

LUCY PERCY, COUNTESS OF CARLISLE

BY SAMUEL COOPER

LADY CRISP

BY NATHANIEL DIXON
(Signed)

ELECTOR GALATINE

BY PETER OLIVER
(Signed 1621)

SHADOWS AND FORM

artist, an individual, direct, and virile power of expression. His art was autographic, in the best sense. He was not content to be merely imitative—in fact, it may be said, he could not be. His manner of expression was the result of an innate knowledge of what was essential to the portrait; it was, in fact, a personal selection of facts, expressed with an impressionistic, not solely an imitative realism, and placed in an atmosphere of light and shade and colour which was both picturesque and dignified.

His balance of light and shade was unique, and as the earlier school of portraitists had used a breadth of light to define the features, so Cooper used his shadows to define the form and emphasise the character.

There is an entry in Evelyn's *Diary* which is an interesting reflection on Samuel Cooper's method of work, and shows with what enthusiasm he tackled the difficult artistic expression of form. It says:—
'January 10, 1662. Being called into his Majesty's closet when Mr. Cooper, ye rare limner, was crayoning of the King's face and head, to make the stamps by, for the new milled money now contriving, I had the honour to hold the candle whilst it was doing, he choosing the night and candle-light for ye better finding out the shadows'—or, as an artist would have put it, for the better finding out the form,—which is the principal use of shadows. It is this power of expressing form which is such an essential characteristic, not only of Cooper's art, but in fact of all the greatest painters.

With the restoration of Charles II., Sir Peter Lely was the presiding genius in portrait-painting, and he is said to have taught nearly all the portrait-painters of this period, both in great and little, and, according to Pepys, lived in great state. We know that he had several miniaturists as pupils who gained considerable reputation, and examples of whose work are in many collections. The most famous of these is Thomas Flatman, who was born in 1637 and died in 1688. He

MINIATURES

was educated at Winchester College, and afterwards at New College, Oxford, where Walpole says he was elected a fellow in 1654, but left without taking a degree. He then became a resident of the Inner Temple, but did not practise as a barrister. His natural bent, however, was artistic, and he seems to have divided his attentions between the two muses, poetry and painting. It is certain that he excelled more as a painter of miniatures than as a poet.

Vertue is said to have pronounced Flatman to be equal to Hoskins and next to Cooper, and the examples of his work which exist go far to prove this statement. It is quite evident to the observer that he was a contemporary of Cooper's, for we see the same harmony of colour and methods of work. The finest specimens of his painting that I know of are at Montagu House. The miniature illustrated from this collection is in every way an excellent example, and possesses many of the qualities of Cooper's work (Plate xiv.). It is a portrait of that interesting parliamentarian, Sir Henry Vane the younger, whose character seems to have been so little understood by his contemporaries. Clarendon, commenting on him, enlarges on the 'wonderful sagacity' with which Vane penetrated the designs of others, and the 'rare dissimulation' with which he concealed his own. He was a statesman of exceptional abilities, and, as the *Dictionary of National Biography* says, 'his devotion to the public service and freedom from corruption were as notorious as his abilities. But his mystical enthusiasm exposed him to the reproach of fanaticism; while his practical astuteness and his subtlety in speculative matters gave colour to the belief that he was crafty and untrustworthy.'

Although a great friend and partisan of Cromwell's, it was Vane's opposition to the Protector's views concerning the constitution of the Parliament which led to the famous scene described by Ludlow: 'When Cromwell called on his musketeers to clear the house, Vane,

THOMAS FLATMAN

observing it from his place, said aloud, "This is not honest; yea, it is against morality and common honesty." On which Cromwell fell a-railing at him, crying out with a loud voice, "O Sir Henry Vane, Sir Henry Vane, the Lord deliver me from Sir Henry Vane!"

After the Restoration Vane was brought to trial by the Parliament of 1661 on a charge of high treason, and after defending himself with great skill and courage, he was found guilty, and was executed on June 14, 1662. The verdict of Pepys was—"In all things he appeared the most resolved man that ever died in that manner."

It is interesting to know that of many satires and ballads that were published, loud in their exultation at the fall of Sir Henry Vane, the only one with any wit and the most popular was written by Thomas Flatman, the painter of this miniature. It was called 'Don Juan Lamberto, or a Comical History of the Late Times, by Montelion, The Knight of the Oracle,' which appeared in 1661, and went through three editions.

The portrait of Mr. Symson, master of music, is equally fine in character and drawing, though it is not perhaps so painter-like in quality or so broad in its effect of light and shade. This miniature belongs to the Duke of Portland's collection (Plate xiv.).

Mary Beale, the daughter of the Rev. Mr. Cradock, of Walton-on-Thames, was a pupil of Lely's. We are indebted to her husband's minute diary of all her doings for considerable details of her life. She must have painted a large number of miniatures, as we are told that she made £429 in one year. An interesting note in the diary is to the effect that on 'Sunday, May 5th, 1672, Mr. Samuel Cooper, the most famous limner of the world, for a face, dyed'—showing in what renown his contemporaries held him. Dr. Propert had in his collection two examples of Mrs. Beale's work: one was a portrait of Andrew Marvell, and the other of John Tillotson, Archbishop of Canterbury. Her son, Charles Beale,

MINIATURES

was also a miniaturist, but failing sight soon obliged him to give up work.

Anne Killigrew, who was born in 1660 and died in 1685, was a maid-of-honour to the Duchess of York, whose portrait she painted, as well as those of the Duke of York and his second wife, Mary of Modena. Dryden has celebrated her genius for painting and poetry, and she seems to have enjoyed some considerable amount of popularity, though I have not come across any of her work.

Sir Peter Lely's most promising scholar was John Greenhill, who painted many miniatures, but owing to a dissolute life he died in the flower of his age. Portraits of Charles II. and his wife, Catherine of Braganza, formerly belonged to Dr. Propert, and were signed examples of this artist's work.

Caspar Netscher, a native of Heidelberg, of the same time as the foregoing, studied under Terburg. His works usually represent domestic subjects, but he also painted excellent miniatures in oil on copper. Walpole says he was invited to England by Sir William Temple, but did not remain here long.

Thomas Sadler, another of Lely's pupils, was a son of a Master in Chancery, and began by painting miniatures for his own amusement, but owing to a reverse of fortune he took to it as a profession. Amongst others, he painted John Bunyan, which Dr. Propert tells us was engraved in mezzotint, and very highly spoken of.

One of the best miniaturists of this time was Nathaniel Dixon, who signed himself N. D., but although there exist many excellent examples of his work, there is nothing known of his life. His manner reminds us of Cooper, especially in his beautiful rendering of the hair.

I am able to give three most excellent specimens of Dixon's work, two of which are signed examples. The one of the politic and fascinating Duchess of Portsmouth



ELIZABETH, COUNTESS OF NORTHUMBERLAND
(UNKNOWN)

SIR HENRY VANE
BY THOMAS FLATMAN
(Signed, 1661)



PORTRAIT OF A LADY
BY NATHANIEL DIXON



MR. SYMSON, MASTER OF MUSIC
BY THOMAS FLATMAN
(Signed)

NATHANIEL DIXON

is excellent in colour, though the reproduction necessarily lacks much of the subtleness of the original (Plate XIII.). Her natural acumen in propitiating the various rival factions at the court of King Charles, and her retention of the king's favour to the end, show that she was a woman of no ordinary ability. It is even said that she was responsible for the series of intrigues with Louis XIV., and did much towards definitely concluding the Treaty of Dover; and all this in spite of her great unpopularity on account of being a Frenchwoman and a Catholic. Her influence was due partly to her courage, or what her biographer terms her *esprit froid*, and to her business capacity; but the chief source of her power lay of course in her personal charm. She was said in times of difficulty to rely chiefly on the influence of tears. Her tastes were recklessly extravagant, and, according to Evelyn, 'her splendid apartment at the end of the gallery at Whitehall was twice or thrice pulled down and rebuilt to satisfy her prodigal and expensive pleasures.' The sums paid to her yearly varied, but in 1681 they amounted to the enormous total of £136,668.

The miniature of Lady Crisp again shows the remarkable fidelity to life of Dixon's portraits (Plate XIII.). Here we have an uncompromising likeness, full of magnificent drawing and beautiful in its strength of characterisation. We can obtain some idea of the colour scheme from the illustration, but cannot realise the vigour and directness of the original, or the purity and harmony of the colouring.

The third example is of an unknown lady, and is a very beautiful miniature (Plate XIV.). It is particularly lovely in colour and charming in drawing. The frizzed hair is of the fairest gold and is most quaintly dressed; the low bodice is a beautiful shade of green-blue trimmed with large pearls, and the complexion is pale and very fair. The portrait of the Countess of Northumberland is not attributed to any artist, but its excellence is its own recommendation. It is delicate in colour and lovely and

MINIATURES

pearly in quality of tone. It is quite worthy of Dixon, and is certainly in his style, and is only one instance of many existing miniatures that display the finest qualities, but which it is impossible to attribute to any individual painter.

Another Dixon, John by name, who was no relation to Nathaniel, was a pupil of Sir Peter Lely's, and painted in miniature and crayons. Miniatures by him are not often met with. There was one of Lady Anne Clifford, daughter and heiress of Richard, Earl of Dorset, and a portrait of Queen Henrietta Maria in the Strawberry Hill collection, and in Lord Oxford's collection there were more than sixty of his works, portraits and historical subjects.

Dixon unfortunately came to grief in a bubble lottery which involved Queen Anne, and comprised the sum of £40,000. He retired to a small estate he had in Suffolk, and died there about 1715.

Amongst other miniaturists of the seventeenth century of whose lives little is known, and even less of their work, we must include the Cleyn family. Francis Cleyn, the father, was the designer of the king's tapestry works at Mortlake, and had several children who became artists in miniature. Evelyn wrote of him : 'A most pious man, father of two sons who were incomparable painters in little, all died in London,' and we know that he also had a daughter named Penelope. There is a miniature mentioned by Vertue, as 'like Cooper's manner, but not so well,' of Dorothea, youngest daughter of Richard Cromwell, October 4, 1688, signed P. C., and there are also signed examples in the possession of Earl Spencer, Mr. Wingfield Digby, and the Rev. W. B. L. Hawkins.

I have selected from the Montagu House collection a very beautiful oil miniature on copper, of Andrew Marvell the poet, 1620-1678 (Plate xv.), which is attributed to Francis Cleyn, one of the sons, and the Earl of Derby possesses another portrait of this poet, which is also given



Sir Nicholas Gripe (OIL)
BY C. JANSEN

Andrew Marvell (OIL)
BY F. CLEYN
James, Duke of Monmouth
BY RICHARD GIBSON

Portrait of Gentleman (OIL)
BY C. JANSEN

THE CLEYN FAMILY

as by this painter. Andrew Marvell, it will be remembered, was the poet of the Protectorate, and composed many poems dedicated to Cromwell. He first came into contact with the heads of the Commonwealth when Lord Fairfax engaged him as tutor to his daughter Mary in 1650. Later he became connected with Cromwell in the private capacity of tutor to his ward William Dutton.

Marvell gave Richard Cromwell unwavering support, and he observes in an elegy, 'A Cromwell in an hour a prince will grow.' At the Restoration, in his later writings, he gives his views pretty openly on the parliament and the king. He declared that the secret of the misgovernment of England was the king's character—'For one man's weakness a whole nation bleeds.' He seems to have retained the good opinion of the king in spite of his satires, and—if tradition is true—notwithstanding his pithy refusal of royal favours, for he is reported to have said 'that it was not in His Majesty's power to serve him.'

The portrait of Colonel John Duckett, originally in the Propert collection, is another well-known oil miniature on copper by this artist.

It has been plausibly suggested that the Cleyne family may be responsible for many of the unsigned miniatures of the seventeenth century, which are usually attributed to Cooper, Flatman, Nathaniel Dixon, and others. Francis Cleyne, the father, taught drawing to the dwarf Richard Gibson, who was a page to a lady at Mortlake, and after studying painting entered the king's service, and produced miniature copies of the royal pictures as well as original portraits (Plate xv.).

The miniatures of George Jamesone are little known, especially in England. He was a Scotsman by birth, and practised his art in his native country. He was called the Vandyck of Scotland, and it is even said that they were fellow-pupils of Rubens at Antwerp. Jamesone's reputation as a portrait-painter was considerable in Edinburgh, where he practised, and he

MINIATURES

obtained many commissions from both Covenanters and Cavaliers. King Charles himself admired his work and gave him a sitting. We have to go to the University of his native Aberdeen, and to the private collections throughout Scotland, to see his portraits of famous men. One of the most curious, and perhaps important, of his works is the genealogical tree, which can be seen at Taymouth Castle, measuring eight feet by five feet, embellished with portraits of the lairds and ladies of the Glenorchy clan.

There appeared in this century a rather interesting and novel form of miniature, which was known as 'plumbago.' It was in reality a small portrait executed in lead pencil, in a highly finished and mezzotint manner. These portraits were principally executed by engravers, who drew them from life with the object of engraving from them. Thomas Forster at the commencement of the eighteenth century produced many portraits in this medium, and there exist many signed examples of his work. As there does not appear to be any account of him, it is uncertain whether he was an engraver.

The skilful perfection of Forster's pencil can be well studied at South Kensington, where there are several specimens exhibited of his miniatures in plumbago. I am able to give an exceptionally good one from the collection of miniatures owned by the Duke of Portland. It represents William III., and from the same collection is reproduced a delightful portrait, in the same manner, by Isabey, of the King of Rome when a child (Plate XVI.).

The originals for the well-known engraved portraits after David Loggan were drawn in this manner, and a magnificent example of the marvellous detail displayed in his drawings may be seen in the portrait of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, in the British Museum. This is slightly tinted with colour in the face, which is full of subtle character. John Faber the elder worked both in plumbago and pen and ink on vellum. That this method was not entirely a new one is proved by the



William IV (PLUMBAGO)
BY THOMAS FORSTER. (SIGNED)



The King of Rome. (PLUMBAGO)
BY J. B. ISABEY. (SIGNED)

REALISM TO INSIPID IDEALISM

portrait I give of Peter Oliver by himself, which is executed in pencil and then coloured in the face and hair.

We have now reached the end of the seventeenth century, and with it practically ends the greatest period of the art of miniature.

Portraiture in this century had been completely lifted out of its original and archaic mannerisms. At the same time it still retained all the traditional truth to nature which was so typical of the Flemish and parent school. Realism was no longer gross, but was refined and dignified by a wider knowledge of pictorial effect, and a greater and deeper knowledge of selection. And it is only necessary to compare the portraits of the early seventeenth century with those of the latter half, to recognise at once that this sterner realism of the earlier period was a sign of strength and not weakness.

The reign of Charles II., with its indolent profligacy and self-indulgent sensuousness, was gradually reflected in the art of the time. Portraits became more and more vapid and licentious in their motives, in an attempt to portray the wanton charms of the many court beauties. We can well imagine the envies and jealousies that were rampant, and the desire of the less honest portrait-painters of this time to please, pamper, and cajole the many sitters, and to offend none. Hence an insipid idealism was the characteristic of most of the portraits painted in the period that followed, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and a consequent decay in the art of portraiture in all its branches. Even in the miniaturists we see the baneful influence of Sir Godfrey Kneller's slovenly conventionalisms, and this degeneracy continued until the middle of the new century.

CHAPTER VI

THE DECADENCE OF MINIATURE PAINTING IN THE EARLY EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

UNTIL the end of the seventeenth century all miniatures in water-colour had been painted on vellum or card, and those in oil on panel, copper, slate, and sometimes silver. About this time—the actual date is very uncertain—a new material was introduced. This new basis was ivory, and its use gradually became more and more popular, until it finally usurped the place of all other materials for water-colour miniatures. Its influence on the character of miniature painting was most marked, and the result of several centuries shows that it has not been entirely beneficial. I am inclined to the opinion that its virtues, if they can be called such, whilst facilitating brilliancy of tone, have tended on the whole to produce an effeminacy in the character and quality of the technique, which has helped towards the general decadence. Great masters have produced beautiful works on this material in spite of its characteristics, rather than because of them; and this, I think, can be proved by a careful study of the later eighteenth century painters, who excelled in ivory miniatures.

Of course, in making this assertion I place my judgment of what constitutes a perfect miniature on a higher plane than the attainment of mere prettiness or charm—on an appreciation of something more than a mere conventional rendering of the colour and contours of a face, however dexterously expressed.

COOPER AND COSWAY

It is hardly fair, perhaps, to compare the eighteenth century school of ivory miniatures with the seventeenth century paintings on vellum. The motives and inspiration of each were completely at variance with one another ; and again, the seventeenth century genius of Samuel Cooper was on an altogether higher level than that of Cosway in the eighteenth. It is probable that had the former painted on ivory, he would have achieved as much distinction in his work as he did by the use of other materials. We can, however, advantageously analyse the general tendency of a school, and the greatest exponents of this later development have pre-eminently succeeded best in those qualities which are to be characterised as graceful rather than great.

The use of ivory did not become general until Cosway's time, when his genius, arriving as it did after a long period of decadence in the art, appealed so strongly to a refined and idealised taste for the beautiful in portraiture, as to obliterate completely the memory of former masters. And it has set a standard of grace and refinement which has ever since been accepted as the only possible guide to the rendering of a lady's portrait 'in little.' We must, however, first concern ourselves with that more or less depressing epoch which preceded Cosway.

The seventeenth century, or what for my purpose I may call the Stuart dynasty, had been fruitful of great things in the world of art, and miniaturists had been in no way behind their more ambitious brothers of the brush. This period shows the first great rise and development of portrait-painting in England, under the stimulating patronage of Charles I., to whom we can hardly give sufficient credit for his influence in forming a truly noble English school of portraiture, culminating in the art of Sir Antony Vandyck, Samuel Cooper, and Sir Peter Lely. Unfortunately, such eminence as was attained by Samuel Cooper and his contemporaries was not to continue, and portraiture gradually degenerated during the Restoration, its motives becoming more

MINIATURES

flippant and less sincere, until, at the death of Queen Anne and the rise of the House of Brunswick, the art was indeed in a sorry plight.

That the commencement of the eighteenth century was a degenerate period in the arts is evident from the fact that Sir Godfrey Kneller was the leading portrait-painter of the time—a painter who was content to reduce his profession to something little better than a trade in portraiture, and to use his considerable talents only as a means of filling his coffers by as small an expenditure of effort as was consistent with a superficial reputation. But matters were to go from bad to worse, for the painters who followed Kneller helped on the downfall of the arts from the high position to which Vandyck and even Lely had raised them, until the lowest depths were reached in the reign of George I. by the work of Jervas. His powers as a portrait-painter are accurately summed up by Dr. Arbuthnot. Jervas pretended to be a freethinker, and one day was talking very irreverently of the Bible to Arbuthnot. The latter maintained that Jervas was not only a speculative but a practical believer, and Jervas defied him to prove it. The doctor quietly replied: ‘You strictly observe the second commandment, for in your pictures you make not the likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth.’

There were, however, one or two miniaturists who helped to carry on the magnificent traditions which Samuel Cooper had created. In the beginning of the century we have Laurence Crosse and Bernard Lens, the first of whom at his best is worthy to rank with the seventeenth century miniaturists.

Laurence Crosse was working towards the end of the seventeenth century, and died about 1724. The two principal characteristics of his work are the fine dot-like stipple, which uniformly shows over the entire surface of his portraits, giving a mezzotint quality, and his blackness, or lack of colour in the shadows and half-tones.



*John Hollar.
Duke of Newcastle.*



*Sarah Jennings.
Duchess of Marlborough.*

LAURENCE CROSSE

The drawing of the faces is often very good, but lacking directness of definition. His tones are broad in effect, and his treatment of the hair is evidently acquired from the study of his greater predecessors. Like some other miniature painters, he was celebrated for his miniature copies of well-known pictures, and he possessed a fine collection of the works of Hilliard, the Olivers, Hoskins, and Cooper, including, Dr. Propert says, the only portrait of Hoskins known, a profile head in crayons; but this can hardly be true, inasmuch as there is in the collection of Montagu House a signed miniature of Hoskins by himself, of which an illustration is given on Plate ix. There are many other signed examples of the work of Laurence Crosse in this same collection, the most noteworthy being portraits of Sarah Jennings (Plate xvii.), Samuel Pepys, and the Duke of St. Albans. In the Duke of Portland's collection there are several more, including portraits of John Holles, Duke of Newcastle, and James, Duke of Monmouth. Most of these specimens are soft in technique and black in colour, the miniature of the Duke of Newcastle being much the finest of the group, in possessing greater firmness and purer colour. This miniature is, in fact, by far the finest example by Laurence Crosse which I have seen, and the illustration gives an excellent idea of its qualities (Plate xvii.). Were it typical of most of this painter's work, there would be little cause to consider him as a decadent, but unfortunately he more often shows a complete lack of quality in the colour of his flesh, stippling in the shadows and half-tones in dead and colourless greys. His drawing lacks precision and grasp of form, which, with his peculiarity of technique, gives a woolly appearance to his miniatures.

John Holles, Duke of Newcastle, was a staunch Protestant and Whig, and one of the richest and most powerful men in the kingdom. He took an active part in promoting the accession of William and Mary. The miniature of Sarah, the shrewd and pugnacious wife of John Churchill, first Duke of Marlborough, is also

MINIATURES

one displaying qualities of colour and refinement which are superior to the usual Laurence Crosse. The colour is pure and transparent in the flesh instead of being black and dirty, the hair is fair, and the bodice is a bright blue ; but, as can be seen in the illustration, the drawing is wanting in decision.

It is related by Horace Walpole that Laurence Crosse was commissioned to repair a miniature of Mary Queen of Scots belonging to the Duke of Hamilton, and to make it as handsome as possible. This Crosse did to such good purpose that he transformed the face of the unfortunate Queen, and made it round and full, so that it was quite unlike other existing portraits, as, for instance, Janet's likeness of her when Queen of France, or the Hilliard in the possession of Mr. Whitehead. However, it is said the miniature was so successful that for many years it was believed to be a sixteenth century painting, and was copied as such a number of times.

Bernard Lens, the miniaturist, was one of a family of artists. He was the son of Bernard Lens the elder, who was a mezzotint engraver and drawing-master, and died in 1755, aged sixty-six. His grandfather, of the same name, and also a painter, died in 1708. The miniaturist was, in Walpole's words, an 'incomparable painter in water-colours.' He had the honour of teaching drawing to the Duke of Cumberland, the Princesses Mary and Louisa, and to Walpole himself. He copied many works by Rubens, Vandyck, and other masters, and these copies are said to possess all the merits of the originals. However this may be, I cannot see anything in most of the miniatures existing to warrant Walpole's great praise. The technique of Bernard Lens is hard and unfeeling—quite the opposite, so far as surface is concerned, to the work of the previous painter. His miniatures, which are often painted on ivory, are smooth and transparent in the flesh-tints, but very solid and opaque in the draperies, which are painted more in the manner of oil. Bernard

BERNARD LENS

Lens seems to have been partial to a very crude light blue in the costumes and draperies, which was much in vogue at the time, and which contrasts very disadvantageously with the softer blues of Cooper's period. There are many examples of his work at Montagu House, and also several typical ones in the Duke of Portland's collection. Judging from these and others I have seen, his work was very unequal. To select the finest, a portrait of a lady of the time of Queen Anne is a very good miniature. It is delicate and pure in colour, and, as the illustration shows, broad and simple in its treatment (Plate XVIII.). Another, of Lord Percy Seymour, although hard, is fine and rich in colour; but one which in many ways is better than either of these two, is the portrait of Matthew Prior (Plate XVIII.). This represents the poet full-face, wearing a turban and a rich brown coat, over which is a reddish gown lined with blue. The illustration can give but little idea of the colour, but its other qualities are better realised.

Matthew Prior was born on July 21, 1664, and died in 1721. He was more of a diplomatist than a poet, and he himself speaks of his poems as 'the product of his leisure hours, who had commonly business enough upon his hands, and was only a poet by accident.' Thackeray, however, sets a greater value on his poetic genius, and says, 'Prior's seem to me amongst the easiest, the richest, the most charmingly humorous of English lyrical poems.' Swift's picture of Prior, as one who 'has generally a cough which he only calls a cold,' and 'who walks in the park to make himself fat,' with Davis's description—a 'thin, hollow-looking man,' and Bolingbroke's '*visage de bois*,' seem to coincide exactly with the portrait of the poet.

There is also a miniature of Alexander Pope, which originally came from Strawberry Hill, and is now, like the others I have mentioned, in the possession of the Duke of Buccleuch.

The miniatures by Bernard Lens I have noticed in

MINIATURES

other collections are not, comparatively speaking, noteworthy, with the exception of the very large portrait of Sarah Jennings, Duchess of Marlborough, signed and dated, which is at South Kensington. This is a good and typical example of the artist's manner, well drawn, strong in technique, but flat in the modelling of the flesh, which is faded in colour, and very crude in the painting of the light blue drapery. It measures about 16 inches by 10½, and can hardly be considered pleasing, because in spite of good qualities it lacks all feeling and subtleness of expression. It is the lack of feeling in this artist's work which prevents many good miniatures by him from appealing to us, and there is little doubt also that the ivory, although giving a high tone to the flesh, has militated against those richer atmospheric and painter-like qualities which are so excellent and apparent in the best miniatures on vellum.

Bernard Lens had two sons who also became miniaturists, Peter Paul and Andrew Benjamin, and they practised in London about the middle of the eighteenth century.

This family were practically the last miniature painters of note for a considerable period, for the dearth of English artists continued until the end of the reign of George II. We find, however, the names of two English portrait-painters, Thomas Worlidge and Gervase Spencer. The former, who was born in 1700, practised in Bath, drawing miniature portraits on vellum, in pencil or Indian ink; he also worked in pastel and oil, but attained most success as an etcher in the manner of Rembrandt. Gervase Spencer, a painter in miniature and enamel who flourished about the middle of the century, began life in domestic service, but by the help of his friends he trained himself in art and became a fashionable painter of the day. He is best known by his enamels, and in this category I shall mention him in a later chapter.

There were several foreign painters who made England their home, or visited this country and achieved some considerable success in the art of miniature. There



PORTRAIT OF A LADY

MATTHEW PRIOR
BY BERNARD LENS

CHRISTIAN RICHTER—JACQUES A. ARLAUD

is a Louis Goupy, mentioned in Bryan's dictionary of painters as a nephew of Bernard Lens, and probably his pupil, who practised in London early in the eighteenth century, but there are no known examples of his work. Dr. Propert says that this painter was uncle to a French artist, Joseph Goupy, a painter and engraver who practised in London about the middle of the century, and was celebrated in his time, having taught the Princess of Wales, and having been appointed cabinet painter to the king. There is also mentioned a brother of Joseph, named Bernard, who was a French miniature painter, and who also made London his home; but their work, like their uncle's, has never been identified.

Christian Richter, a native of Sweden, came to England in 1702 and painted portraits in oils, but is best known by his miniatures. He learned a vigorous manner of drawing and colouring by studying the works of Michael Dahl, and there is much that is really excellent in his work, as may be seen in the miniature of James, Duke of Ormond, which is illustrated here, from the Welbeck collection (Plate xix.) Late in life Richter took up enamelling, but died in 1732, before he had achieved any success in that branch of art.

Jacques Antoine Arlaud is worthy of mention as a miniaturist who gained considerable reputation in Paris, and who visited England and painted several members of the royal family. He was born at Geneva in 1668, and was originally intended for the Church, but he preferred miniature painting. At the age of twenty he left Geneva and worked at Dijon, but soon achieved sufficient success to settle in Paris, where he was patronised by royalty, including the Duke of Orleans and the Princess Palatine. The latter gave him a recommendation to our Queen Caroline, then Princess of Wales. Arlaud's portrait of the princess procured for him the patronage of the nobility, which brought him handsome remuneration, and he took rank amongst the wealthy painters of the period. Earlier in life he had painted the portrait of

MINIATURES

James II., and I give an illustration from a miniature of this king by Arlaud, now in the possession of the Duke of Buccleuch. This is a very fine painting: the gilt steel armour, long greyish wig, red ruffle, and white lace stock form a scheme of colour which can only be appreciated by seeing the original (Plate xix.). In this same collection there is a miniature of Charles Edward Stuart, by the same artist, which, though good, cannot be considered equal to the James II.

Arlaud, besides making a considerable fortune by his art, was of sufficient repute to be honoured by the inclusion of his portrait in the Uffizi Gallery at Florence. He retired to Geneva in 1729, and died there in 1746.

Walpole tells us that Arlaud brought his *chef-d'œuvre* to London with him in 1721. It was a copy of Correggio's 'Leda,' and though he would not sell this picture, he painted a copy of it, for which he is said to have received the incredible sum of six hundred pounds. It is also averred that in 1738, in a fit of piety, he destroyed the original by cutting it up anatomically, and presented the different members to his friends. Benoit Arlaud, a younger brother, painted miniatures in Amsterdam and afterwards in London, where he died in 1719. A few of his portraits are known from engravings.

Although miniature painting lacked noteworthy exponents, there is a redeeming point of interest in the earlier years of the eighteenth century, in the rise and advancement of a new branch of the art—that of enamelling.

It was in the reign of George I. that miniatures in enamel first became the fashion. The two earliest enamel workers of this century in England were Charles Boit and Frederic Zincke. The former was the son of a Frenchman, but was born at Stockholm; and the latter—his far more famous pupil—was a native of Dresden, and is perhaps the best known artist of this period.



JAMES II

BY JAMES ANTONY ARLAUD

JAMES, DUKE OF ORMOND

BY CHRISTIAN RICHTER

JOHN STEPHEN LIOTARD

There are other names of foreign artists in enamel and miniature who worked in England at this time. John Stephen Liotard was born at Geneva in 1702, and went to Paris in 1725, where he became the pupil of J. B. Massé. He practised painting portraits in crayon, miniature, and enamel. In 1738 he went to Naples, and then to Rome, where he painted a likeness of the Pope. Later he visited Constantinople with two English gentlemen, where he adopted the Turkish dress and wore a long beard. From thence he travelled over Europe, and was employed by many notable people, including the Prince of Moldavia and the Empress Maria Theresa. He finally reached London, which he took by storm, as much by his Turkish fez and beard as by his talent, though he painted excellent miniatures of the Princess of Wales, the young princes and other notables. His greatest success was attained by pastel portraits, of which there are two fair examples at South Kensington.

Jean Zurich, son of a jeweller, deserves mention, although quite overshadowed by his countryman Zincke; and also André Rouquet, who followed the latter artist in enamel portraits, and whose principal claim to be remembered is a book, entitled *The Present State of the Arts in England*. This was undoubtedly as deplorable as could well be imagined, and it is all the more surprising inasmuch as the same period brought forth such giants in literature as Dryden, Defoe, Swift, Addison, Steele, Pope, Richardson, and others, and such philosophers and scientists as Locke and Sir Isaac Newton. But if the lowest ebb in the receding tide was reached at the end of George II.'s reign, the return flood was to be remarkable for its swift and rapid progress to highest water-mark.

At this point of the tide in the art history of this country, it may be well to review retrospectively the varying conditions which affected the rise and fall of artistic vitality, and therefore the art of miniature painting, since Holbein first introduced it into England.

MINIATURES

During the whole of this time, native talent had been confined to the exponents of miniature portraits, for Lely and Kneller were both of foreign extraction, and their immediate followers are hardly worthy of consideration. At the time that the Italian Renaissance was at its height, and when England might have profited by the visit to this country of continental artists in the reign of Henry VIII., the Reformation came upon us, and systematically undid all that had been done to lay the foundations for a healthy activity in art. Catholic magnificence, which was the corner-stone of continental art, and might have equally been the foundation-stone of our own, was swept away by the mistaken zeal of the early reformers, and we were left high and dry on a barren shore, with little or no tradition behind us, and nothing but a prospect of dead-level monotony before us. This condition of things continued until the reign of Charles I., when the appearance of Rubens and Vandyck in this country again opened a new prospect to British art, and this in spite of many adverse circumstances which militated against its encouragement. The foreign wars of Henry and Elizabeth, and the continual contest with the Roman Church, had retarded any national development of the arts, and it may be said, with every respect for truth, that Charles I.'s personal tastes and encouragement of both foreign and native talent were the first great stimulus that the arts received in England.

Henry VIII., through a spirit of ostentatious rivalry, rather than any innate knowledge or appreciation of art, had collected a fairly remarkable selection of works of the best painters, containing about one hundred and fifty pictures, including miniatures; but Charles I. with considerable knowledge added greatly to this collection, and in the historic galleries of Whitehall there were no less than four hundred and fifty examples, which included works by Holbein, Correggio, Giulio Romano, Raphael, Rubens, Rembrandt, Tintoretto, Titian, Vandyck, Paul Veronese, and Leonardo da Vinci. With such an example

VARYING INFLUENCES ON ENGLISH ART

before them it is not surprising that the nobles emulated their monarch, and purchased works of art whenever opportunity offered. The Duke of Buckingham succeeded, in 1620, in purchasing Rubens's own private collection, which in itself was a priceless series of fine works by some of the greatest Italian masters. Prince Henry followed in the footsteps of his royal father, and the Earl of Arundel formed a noble collection of works of art, besides which the courts of Europe sent valuable gifts of master-pieces.

In this reign England was given the opportunity of appreciating the noblest productions of the greatest masters the world has seen, and the failure of British talent to take advantage of it is told in the succeeding epoch of the rise of the Commonwealth, and the consequent iconoclastic propensities of the Puritans to destroy all works of art which were termed superstitious, as well as those which tended to increase external dignity. Art was in fact denounced as superfluous, if not actually baneful, under the Puritans. If their orders were not always carried out to the full extent, we may partially credit Cromwell with a deliberate interference, for, as we have seen in preceding chapters, he undoubtedly encouraged as far as was in his power the native talent of portraiture that was at hand. Unfortunately, what was left undone by the Puritans was well-nigh completed by the disastrous fire at Whitehall in January 1698, which destroyed a number of priceless possessions. During the remaining reigns of the Stuart dynasty, as we have seen, British art gradually degenerated, and at no time showed more than a certain facility for imitation, without any of the intellectual qualities necessary to its progression as a nobler school.

CHAPTER VII

THE RENAISSANCE OF MINIATURE PAINTING

IF we have just cause to deplore the depths into which the fine arts had fallen in this country during the first half of the eighteenth century, it is with the greater pleasure that we review the unique and phenomenal period which followed. In one great wave our National School of Painting reached a higher level than it had ever attained before, and the combined genius of Reynolds, Gainsborough and Romney carried portraiture to such a zenith of masterly inspiration, that their influence will remain a vital force in the history of the world's art for all time.

Such names as these cannot fail to awaken enthusiasm and admiration in the least appreciative minds, by the wealth of beauty and genius with which they are associated in the history of English portraiture.

It is always very difficult to explain the sudden springing into existence of a master mind, and this eighteenth century cycle of genius cannot be adequately accounted for by any contemporaneous influences. Certainly to know that so mediocre a painter as Hudson should have a Reynolds for a pupil, only emphasises the fact that 'art can be learned but not taught.'

Before the advent of Sir Joshua Reynolds there was little to indicate that we were on the eve of so magnificent a revival. Sir James Thornhill was State painter to Queen Anne and George I.; and though William Hogarth could paint excellent portraits, he had principally exhibited his great didactic and satirical humour in

HOGARTH'S FRANKNESS OF UTTERANCE

pictorial tableaux, which were more akin to the art of the novelist than to that of the painter. Nevertheless it is in the genius and individuality of Hogarth that we can see the first healthy signs of a revolt against an unhealthy and lifeless conventionalism. It is also to Hogarth that credit is due for the initial idea of forming a gallery of modern paintings at the Foundling Hospital, which ultimately resulted in the formation of an annual exhibition of living masters, and finally led to the incorporation of the Royal Academy under the patronage of George III.

It was at the moment of its deepest depression, when English art was a mass of insincerity, without any honesty of purpose or healthy inspiration, and unredeemed even by fine technical qualities, that Hogarth stepped to the front of the stage. With a truly English frankness of utterance, with an entirely new and vigorous mode of expression, he showed the world at large that the tragi-comedy of daily existence was more worthy of an artist's pencil than all the studio-created shams which had passed for high art. Ruthlessly and relentlessly he exposed the prevalent impostures of his time. Without any technical brilliancy, but with a consummate skill in draughtsmanship, he expressed himself with a power and directness which went straight to the point, whilst he amused by his satirical humour.

Whatever may have been the influence which Hogarth's plain speaking had on society, to the artist of his own and succeeding periods he stands for freedom and individualism—for realism of characterisation and the study of the actualities of life, as opposed to the conventional rendering of classic mythologies—or, in simple words, for the study of nature.

Notwithstanding that Reynolds incessantly preached the study of the old masters, it is an unique and virile study of nature, combined with an unusual power of selection and insight into character, that distinguishes his work. As Hogarth struck at the shams of society, Reynolds and Gainsborough struck at the false principles

MINIATURES

of the portrait-painter. They swept the studio clear of the stereotyped properties and paraphernalia which were deemed such an essential adjunct to the fashionable artist. They proved that an artist worthy of the name could produce portraits full of the natural character of the sitter, full of the life and soul of the man, and yet full of dignity, without having recourse to extravagant posture or impossible draperies. Reality was the first inspiration; composition, costume, colour, and all the other professional weapons which the artist has power to wield, were the second.

One of the greatest influences for good in promoting a wider and more cultured knowledge of art at this time was the formation of the Royal Academy.

The immediate cause of the creation of this historic body of artists was due to the squabbles and dissensions between the initial Society of Arts, founded in 1754, the Society of Artists of Great Britain, incorporated in 1765, and a rival society, called the Free Society of Artists, which had been formed by a body of men who refused any allegiance to the Incorporated Society. Reynolds took no part in the disagreement between these societies, and it was during his absence abroad that the climax arrived. At an important meeting of the Incorporated Society, sixteen of the directors were defeated and the remaining eight resigned. These defeated artists took steps to form a new society, and they placed their project before the king for his approval. After some persuasion Reynolds agreed to attend an inaugural meeting for the selection of names for the new academy, and was then nominated the first president on the list which they submitted to the king. The next day His Majesty signed the document which created the Royal Academy. It met for the first time on December 14, 1768.

The original list of Academicians included such well-known artists as Chambers, Bartolozzi, Cosway, Cipriani, Moser, Meyer, Nollekens the sculptor, Sandby, West, Hone, Zoffany, and Zuccarelli, and there were also the

HORACE WALPOLE AND THE ARTS

only two lady artists who have ever been similarly honoured—Mary Moser and Angelica Kauffmann. There were in all thirty-six foundation members, and Reynolds, as their president, immediately received the honour of knighthood.

I have said that there was little to indicate that we were on the eve of such a renaissance before the advent of Sir Joshua Reynolds, but it must be acknowledged that on the accession of George II. in 1727 there was a first indication of the coming dawn. George II. cared as little about art as did his father, which is proved by his well-known saying, that ‘he saw no use in Bainting and Boetry’; nevertheless, there was to be noted a distinct impulse in the direction of art culture, and the establishment of the Dilettanti Society for the object of encouraging a taste for the archæological side of art is one of the signs of this impulse. Later it was supported in a more practical manner by the Society of Arts. Both societies established prizes for competition among artists, and lent their rooms for exhibitions, extending their patronage to art and artists with the sincerest motives. Due justice must also be done to such indefatigable enthusiasts for all that was beautiful in art as George Vertue and Horace Walpole. All lovers of art and writers on art most assuredly owe a deep debt of gratitude to the untiring patience and researches of the one, and the rare culture and taste of the other. It is not detrimental to either to say that without George Vertue’s researches we should have lacked Horace Walpole’s fascinating chronicles, and that without Walpole’s style and good judgment, Vertue’s labours would have lost most of their value.

Walpole himself, speaking in 1762, gracefully says: ‘At this epoch of common sense, one may reasonably expect to see the arts flourish to as proud a height as they attained at Athens, Rome, or France. Painting has hitherto made but faint efforts in England. Our eloquence and the glory of our arms have been carried to the highest pitch. If there are any talents among us

MINIATURES

this seems the crisis for their appearance: the throne itself is now the altar of the graces, and whoever sacrifices to them becomingly is sure that his offerings will be smiled upon by a prince who is at once the example and patron of accomplishments.'

Of the three great portrait-painters of the English renaissance Reynolds undoubtedly exercised the greatest influence over his contemporaries, and his influence is peculiarly evident in the work of the miniaturists of this period. There are few of any eminence whatever who have not borrowed something from this facile craftsman in the art of portraiture.

From the middle of the eighteenth century till the middle of the nineteenth, we have an uninterrupted array of excellent miniaturists, but during the whole of that period, and even to the present day, the name of Richard Cosway has dominated all others.

This prolonged and universal admiration of an artist is in itself a most eloquent eulogium on his merits, though it is not necessarily a convincing proof of his claim to this pre-eminence. That an admiration of Cosway's style is well justified I should be the first to allow, but I would also insist that infatuation is not indicative of intelligent appreciation—that to be sensible of the charm and graceful genius of a Cosway should not make us insensible to the great and noble qualities of a Cooper. If the eighteenth century genius pleases our most sensitive tastes and appetites, the seventeenth century genius stirs our deepest sympathies and appreciations.

It is impossible to deny the charm which a fine Cosway possesses: its refinement, its grace, its delicate dexterity appeal at once to our sense of the beautiful. The directness and easy finesse of the handling, the subtle balance of tone, colour, and modelling, give added power to the expression, forcing us, as it were, to admire what our better judgment would proclaim as insincere.

COSWAY'S GRASP OF ESSENTIALS

There are those who are of the opinion that a miniature should give us only the most flattering aspect of a face. Beauty to them is the crucial test, and if not beautiful, a miniature is unworthy to rank as a fine work of art. Cosway knew this, and he satisfied the most fastidious, or probably refused to paint them at all. But beauty in this narrow sense of the word is not a test of greatness in the artist. To reform a nose, enlarge an eye, or becomingly tint a pale complexion, are by themselves but the sorry performances of a quack portrait-painter. Much has been said about the liquid brilliancy of Cosway's painting of eyes, though no artist of any insight would seriously consider it worthy of notice. It is little more than a trick, as we should understand it, which can be explained by the fact that the eyes are often made the darkest and sharpest point in the miniature, to which all else yields.

It is certain that Cosway was the first miniaturist to evolve a style to correspond with the peculiar properties of ivory as a base to paint on. Ivory, as we have seen, had been used to some extent previous to his time, by such painters as Bernard Lens, but he had only taken advantage of a portion of its characteristics; he still maintained a solid and opaque method of work in the costumes and backgrounds, and moreover he still treated his subjects in a heavy and somewhat laborious manner, which was much more fitted to the peculiar qualities of vellum and card. Cosway's instinctive ability for seizing essentials showed him that a material which possessed such brilliant and transparent qualities, and at the same time so little absorbency, was one to be treated in a different manner;—that where the brush was able to pass easily over a surface which reflected the faintest echoes of the mind, it should not be forced to tread with lumbering footsteps or to linger over its task;—that the handling of the tones should not be rude and boisterous, killing by their strength the very essence of the pearliness and liquidness of the theme, but that they should be in

MINIATURES

gradations which were tender, soft, and radiant, like the fleeciness of summer clouds; and Cosway knew that if his touch was to be swift, sensitive, and sure, it must also be true and unerring, that the hand must wait upon the brain and not lag tediously behind. It is the fullest appreciation of all these things which gives Cosway's work that distinction and style which any number of blue-cloud backgrounds, bright eyes or white frills are of themselves powerless to do. It was, to put it in a more direct way, the perfect correspondence between his methods, his motives and his materials, which was at once the admiration of clients and contemporaries, and has enabled him to retain the first place in the eyes of posterity.

Because of these charms of execution Cosway's art is the worst possible style to imitate; it is too personal and individual, too brilliant and effervescent. To try and catch the fickle movement of his pencil is to tumble headlong into an abysmal confusion; and to imitate only tricks of colour or manner is to achieve nothing. That many of the eighteenth century miniaturists adopted certain of the essential characteristics of Cosway's manner is evident and natural, inasmuch as they lived in a similar environment and were inspired by contemporary fashions and requirements. But there were other inspirations which modified and fertilised the art of the lesser masters, and of these the genius of Sir Joshua Reynolds was the most important.

The earliest miniaturists whose names are associated with the Renaissance, are painters on enamel, and, as such, will be more fully dealt with in a later chapter on enamellists. Michael Moser, Jeremiah Meyer, and Nathaniel Hone were all foundation members of the Royal Academy. The first mentioned, Michael Moser, distinguished himself in several branches of art, being a painter, modeller, sculptor, and medallist, and amongst other works executed the Great Seal of England. His daughter, Mary Moser, was one of the only two ladies

SAMUEL AND RICHARD COLLINS

ever elected to Royal Academy honours, and was an original member of that body. She was a most excellent painter of flowers.

Jeremiah Meyer received the double appointment of enamel painter to George III. and miniature painter to Queen Charlotte, and seems to have succeeded equally well in both mediums.

The third artist, Nathaniel Hone, commenced by painting life-size portraits in oil; he then took to water-colours, and finally to enamels. He had a son, Horace Hone, who was also a miniaturist.

Samuel Finney and William Prewitt are two more enamellists who worked at this time. The former appears to have been also a water-colour miniaturist, as he was appointed painter in both capacities to the queen.

We now come to two artists of the name of Collins. Samuel Collins was the son of a clergyman, and was born at Bristol. He started his profession of miniaturist at Bath, where he soon obtained a very large practice. Amongst other pupils he instructed Ozias Humphry. Eventually he removed to Dublin, where he met with much success, but very few details of his life are known. He painted both on enamel and on ivory, and won a great reputation. Portraits by him of George III. and of the second Viscount Gaze were exhibited at the special exhibition of portrait miniatures in 1865.

Richard Collins is said to have been the chief miniature and enamel painter to George III. He was born in Hampshire in 1755, dying in 1831, and became a pupil of Jeremiah Meyer. Although Collins is reputed to have enjoyed a great deal of patronage, and must have painted a number of miniatures, including portraits of the royal family, there are not many examples of his work to be found in existing collections. Perhaps some few of his miniatures, signed R. C., have been erroneously attributed to Richard Cosway. I am able, however, to give a reproduction from a very pretty example at Montagu

MINIATURES

House, a more or less fancy portrait of Princess Amelia at her spinning-wheel (Plate xx.).

The earliest of the more important eighteenth century miniaturists was John Smart, whom some critics place second only to Cosway, and at the head of his contemporaries. He was one of the very few miniaturists who were honoured by a favourable commendation from the great man, and at one time could count Cosway as a good friend. He must not be confused with Samuel Paul Smart, who painted and exhibited many miniatures between the years 1774 and 1787. John Smart painted portraits in oil and also landscapes, but it was for his miniatures that he was so much admired in his own day, which, to quote a contemporary writer, were such 'surprising likenesses.' This truth and sincerity of portraiture, with a happy faculty of catching a pleasing expression, are the strongest points to be noticed in this painter's work. Smart was born in 1741 at Norwich, and at fourteen years of age obtained a premium from the Society of Arts for a chalk drawing. He was a pupil of Daniel Dodd, and also studied at Shipley's famous academy in St. Martin's Lane, where so many of the painters of his time had first essayed to woo their fair mistress. Early in his career he became a member of the Incorporated Society of Artists, and later was made a director of the society, finally being elected its vice-president. About the year 1789 Smart went to India, and practised with great success in Madras and other cities, returning to England about 1793. After this he exhibited at the Royal Academy regularly until his death, which took place at his residence, 2 Russell Place, Fitzroy Square, in 1811. He was accustomed to give his address as Ipswich in the Academy catalogues, and it is curious to find that two years after his death a landscape by him with this address was hung at the Royal Academy. One of the most distinctive characteristics of Smart's work is the smooth quality of finish he was able to attain, which has so often been likened to enamel.



A BOY
BY NATHANIEL HONE

PRINCESS AMELIA
BY RICHARD COLLINS

A GIRL
BY DANIELS

PRINCESS LIEVEN
BY UPTON

JOHN SMART

The fineness of the stipple and the flatness and purity of the colour would not alone give us this quality without his 'tight' firmness of gradation and modelling. He usually signed his miniatures J. S., and there is a fair number of examples of his work in the best known collections. At South Kensington we have several, and at Hertford House there is a very good portrait of a lady, which is illustrated here (Plate XXI.).

Without any ostentatious cleverness, Smart painted with a thoroughness and delicacy which have a charm of their own, and his miniatures no doubt appealed to that less 'flash' portion of society which valued an excellent portrait more than an idealised semblance of a person. Though the miniatures by John Smart are often considered to be of exceptional merit, and at the present time fetch fancy prices, I am inclined to think that their laborious and over-modelled gradations of the flesh-tints place them outside the category of masterpieces. Smart strove for truth of portraiture and obtained it, if we may judge his miniatures by their life-like expression and absence of flattery; but he lacks inspiration in his treatment of the lighting, and massing of the shadows, and the way the subjects fit their ovals is often a little awkward, and without any feeling for line or composition. Among the recurring characteristics of this painter the effective use of a solid neutral tint for the backgrounds may be noted. We are told that he was largely employed by the royal family. This seems to apply to every miniaturist of any note whatever during the reign of George III., and it is probably due to this fact that so many painters took up this branch of art and succeeded so well. It was an age when black patches and miniatures were worn by every dame who could afford to adorn herself *à la mode*. John Smart, the son, also painted miniatures, and exhibited at the Royal Academy occasionally, but in 1808 he went to India, and died at Madras in 1809.

Ozias Humphry was one of the most charming miniaturists of the eighteenth century renaissance. He be-

MINIATURES

longed to an old family whose native place was Honiton, in Devonshire. He was born in 1742, and was educated at the local grammar school. Very early in life, Humphry showed a passion for drawing, and his parents, yielding to his entreaties, sent him to London, and he studied at Shipley's art school for over two years, but the death of his father soon after forced him to return to his native place. However, Humphry was determined to pursue his profession, and he became articled to Samuel Collins, who was practising at Bath. In 1763, when only twenty-one years of age, he returned to London, and on showing Sir Joshua Reynolds some of his miniatures, was cordially invited by the president to settle near him, and in the following year we find that he rented lodgings at 21 King Street, Covent Garden.

The year 1766 was the real commencement of Humphry's success, when he exhibited a portrait miniature of John Mealing, an old Academy model. This miniature was much admired, and purchased by the king for one hundred guineas, who also commissioned the young artist to paint a large miniature of the queen and others of the royal family. Humphry from this time practised his art with extraordinary success, and was much patronised by the Duke of Dorset throughout his career. In the year 1773, according to a contemporary writer, a fall from his horse in Great George Street, Westminster, injured him so seriously that his nervous system was broken. Others say that he was broken-hearted by the refusal of James Payne, the architect, to accept him as a suitor for his daughter's hand.

Whatever the cause, Humphry left London, and, accompanied by his friend Romney, went to Rome, where he resided four years and studied the great masters of oil painting. In 1777 he was again in England, and this time he took up his residence in Newman Street, London, and devoted himself principally to painting in oil. During this stay in England, it is said that Dr. Wolcot requested Humphry to receive into his house



Lady Eglinton
BY WILLIAM WOOD



Portrait of a Lady
BY JOHN SMART

OZIAS HUMPHRY

‘an uncouth, raw-boned country lad who had run mad with paint.’ This youth gave his services to clean brushes and palettes and make himself generally useful, in return for the honour and profit of being with so distinguished a painter, and he justified this enthusiasm in later life by becoming the famous John Opie, R.A., lecturer on painting to the Royal Academy. In 1785, by the advice of Sir Robert Strange, Humphry embarked for India, and at Calcutta he again took seriously to miniature painting. He visited the courts of Moorshedabad, Benares, and Lucknow, where he painted some large miniature portraits of Indian princes and other persons of distinction. His bad health, however, prevented him from staying longer in India than the year 1788, when he again returned to London and resumed miniature painting at St. James Street, the miniatures which he exhibited during this period greatly increasing his reputation.

Ozias Humphry was elected an A.R.A. in 1779, and an R.A. in 1790. For the last fifteen years of his life his eyesight was too defective for miniature work, and he was compelled to devote himself to working in crayons. It was whilst engaged in executing a series of miniatures from family portraits at Knole for the Duke of Dorset that his eyesight gave way. His great success in the new medium of crayons soon placed him in the position of chief exponent of this art, and in 1792 he was appointed portrait-painter in crayons to the king. The last portraits he executed were of the Prince and Princess of Orange, after which, in 1797, his eyesight completely failed him. The rest of his life was passed in seclusion, and he died in Thornhaugh Street, 9th March 1810.

Ozias Humphry was the possessor of more than ordinary talent. Apart from the fact that his life-size portraits in oil are excellent, if somewhat reminiscent of Sir Joshua Reynolds, his crayon drawings show an admirable feeling of refinement and correct draughtsman-ship, and he is certainly one of those miniaturists whose

MINIATURES

work stands out as unique for its beauty of execution, its mellowness of colour and tone, and graceful arrangement. The technical execution of his miniatures has been associated with the work of his contemporary, John Smart, and both displayed a very high degree of uniformity and fineness of stipple; but the best examples of Humphry's art should not be likened to enamels, his soft, atmospheric qualities of tone and colour being quite distinct from the sister art. Of the many miniaturists who came under the influence of Reynolds, Humphry undoubtedly shows it in his work more than any other, though all of his contemporaries were affected in a greater or less degree by the lofty ideals displayed in the art of this great master.

The portraits by Ozias Humphry in the royal collection at Windsor give us an excellent idea of their source of inspiration. The three-quarter length portrait of Queen Charlotte, seated with one arm raised and toying with her necklace, is a veritable Sir Joshua in little, in respect to its pose, composition, general treatment of light and shade, and graceful dignity of carriage. It is withal a most excellent and life-like portrait, most accurately drawn and painted, and in every way an eloquent testimony to Humphry's skill. The dainty little portrait of the Princess Royal, when a child, daughter of George III., from this collection, shows us the same inspiration (Plate xxx.). It is most truly a gem in sweetness of colour, in grace of pose and charm of expression. This quaint little maid is attired in a blue muslin dress and cap. The drawing and colouring of the face and arms are most delicate and beautiful. She is seated demurely between a Greek vase and a rich ruby curtain, and the conventionality of the arrangement seems to add much to the natural charm of the figure.

James Nixon was another very good miniaturist, born in the same year as Smart (1741). He first exhibited in 1765 at the Incorporated Society of Artists, of which he became a member. He studied at the Royal Academy,

RICHARD CROSSE

and was elected an Associate of that body in 1778. Nixon received court patronage, and held the appointments of limner to the Prince of Wales and miniature painter to the Duchess of York. Many of the theatrical celebrities of the day were painted by him, including Miss Farren, and a number of these portraits have been engraved. James Nixon resided in London throughout his professional career, and died at Tiverton in 1812, aged seventy-one.

Dr. Propert possessed several interesting examples of Nixon's work, amongst them being portraits of Eliza Farren, Countess of Derby, and Mrs. Harlowe the actress. Speaking of the latter, he tells us that in the figure and hands of this example, Nixon, in his opinion, very nearly attained to the excellence of Vandyck. Certainly his adaptation of a Reynolds-like pose and treatment adds a distinction to work which is always accurate and pleasing.

Here must be mentioned another miniature painter who, curiously enough, came from the same county, was born in the same year (1742), and died at the same age as Ozias Humphry. Richard Crosse was a native of Devonshire, and had the misfortune to be both deaf and dumb. This fact probably stood in the way of his successful courtship of Miss Copley, who refused him and subsequently married Benjamin Haydon, and was the mother of B. R. Haydon, the famous historical painter. This disappointment in early life no doubt influenced his whole career, for he is said to have lived in retirement. He came to London and practised miniature painting, and was a member of the Free Society of Artists in 1763. His first appearance at the Royal Academy was in 1770, and he continued to exhibit there until 1795. He resided during this period in Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, and was appointed painter in enamel to George III. He, however, practised very little in later life, and soon after his appointment retired to Wells and lived with a brother of Miss Copley. Haydon in his diary gives a pathetic

MINIATURES

account of an unexpected interview after thirty years between Crosse and his old love, who came to Wells on a visit to her brother. It was their last meeting, for Mrs. Haydon died on her journey to London. Crosse died at his birthplace—Knowle, in Devonshire, in 1810. Besides painting miniatures, which are notable for their delicate colouring, he painted small full-length water-colours, and exhibited in 1788 a portrait in this manner of Mrs. Billington, the great singer. The Rev. R. B. Carew of Collipriest, near Tiverton, possesses numerous miniatures by Richard Crosse, and the South Kensington Museum has a miniature by him of Captain Swinburne.

Richard Crosse displayed in his work a character, quality of colour and high finish which are excelled by few of his contemporaries.

The miniaturists that now come under notice I have thought best to classify in a group by themselves, and to consider as belonging to the school of Cosway. In their work we find evident traces of the influence which Cosway's great popularity and success had in determining finally the treatment which was to be the fashionable and most successful one for miniatures on ivory. Amongst this group of artists there are some who achieved other qualities as well, which can be traced to the study of Reynolds, their colour being richer and their modelling and tone fuller than Cosway's work could have inspired.

The first in point of date is Samuel Shelley, who was a native of Whitechapel, where he was born in 1750. Shelley was almost entirely self-educated, his work lacks vigour of character, but displays a very pretty and fanciful treatment. Exhibiting first at the Incorporated Society in 1773, he followed in the next year with some miniatures at the Royal Academy, and continued to exhibit till the year 1804, in one year having no less than nine miniatures hung. It was then that he and others expressed dissatisfaction at the treatment which was accorded to water-

SAMUEL SHELLEY AND WILLIAM WOOD

colour painting by the Academy, and with W. F. Wells, R. Hills, and W. H. Pyne, founded the Water-Colour Society (known as the Old Water-Colour Society), of which he was the treasurer until 1807. Shelley died on December 22, 1808. It was his pretty manner of painting children in a light graceful style which made him one of the fashionable miniaturists of his day, ranking with Smart, though in no way equal to him in technique. Like so many others, Shelley greatly admired Sir Joshua Reynolds, and gained much from copying him; and in an age when Cosway's art was so much the fashion, it is not surprising that many appreciated the lesser master's delicate manipulation.

Shelley designed some graceful compositions from Shakespeare, Tasso, and other poets, which were engraved by Bartolozzi, Caroline Watson, and others. One of the most charming examples of his miniature painting that I have seen is a group of three children with a dog, belonging to Henry Drake, Esq. Shelley was particularly partial to grouping two or more portraits in an oval, and it is his clever and playfully natural manner of doing this which is more reminiscent of Reynolds than any more solid qualities. He at the same time certainly affected the Cosway style of treatment, but never attained the originator's freedom or flexibility of touch and purity and precision of work. The pretty portrait of a girl on Plate xxvi. is from the collection of Sir Tollemache Sinclair, and is typical of many of Shelley's single portrait miniatures.

William Wood was an artist of the same school, who is very little known. He was born in 1768, in Suffolk, and died in 1809. His miniatures approach somewhat in technical qualities to the work of Cosway, but might be more accurately compared to Engleheart. He was addicted to painting his flesh in a very low tone of colour, and to using a strong greenish grey in the half-tones. The principal specimens of his work are still in his home county and its neighbourhood. Dr. Propert

MINIATURES

was of the opinion that his work should be much better known than it is. Mr. Jeffery Whitehead possesses several examples, and there are a few others in the collections of well-known connoisseurs, including one of Lady Eglinton, belonging to Sir Tollemache Sinclair, illustrated in these pages (Plate XXI.). Certainly the miniatures I have seen by this painter display very excellent qualities of drawing, if a little academic in their manner of execution. He exhibited from 1788 to 1807.

It is not surprising that George Engleheart's work shows indications of a very close study of Reynolds, as he was one of the President's pupils, and in the course of his career copied a number of his pictures. Of all Cosway's compeers, I can well believe that Engleheart was his most serious rival, though it is probable that the brilliant society over which the Prince of Wales held sway, which patronised the more enterprising painter, was distinct from the numerous patrons who were admirers of Engleheart's more sincere portraits.

George Engleheart was born in 1752, and was one of the younger sons of Francis Engleheart, a member of a noble Silesian family who came to England in the time of George II., and settled at Kew. Young Engleheart, after having studied landscape for a short time, entered the studio of Sir Joshua Reynolds. At the age of twenty-one he first exhibited at the Royal Academy, and sent three works, two of which were landscapes—a view of the royal palace at Kew, and a landscape with cattle, the third being a portrait of a child. After this first essay in other fields he seems to have devoted his talents exclusively to miniature portraits and small drawings, achieving a great success and an extensive patronage. Engleheart was by all accounts a great favourite with George III., whose portrait he painted and exhibited in 1789, being appointed miniature painter to His Majesty in 1790. At this time he was living in Hertford Street, Mayfair. Engleheart worked occasionally on enamel, and often drew pencil portraits on paper, which were nearly always in profile

GEORGE ENGLEHEART

and coloured in water-colours, showing excellent qualities of character and precision of work. His ivory miniatures are by far the most interesting portion of his achievement. Many of these he exhibited at the Royal Academy between 1773 and 1812, and amongst them were a number of his copies from pictures by Sir Joshua Reynolds. Engleheart died at Blackheath in 1839.

The miniatures of Engleheart have a character and strength in the drawing which are not peculiar to Cosway's work, and are quite absent in the work of Plimer. Although he was not afraid of painting a plain face, nor of giving us something more than the sentimental side of his sitter's physiognomy, yet he was not devoid of the prevailing tendency of the Cosway school to generalise too much in the size and relative importance of the features, which mitigates against its ever being considered a great school of portraiture. In his more ambitious compositions we find much breadth of pictorial arrangement, which has no relationship to Cosway's art, and can only have been attained by an intelligent appreciation of the principles which Reynolds so markedly displayed.

In the numerous collection possessed by Engleheart's grand-nephew, Sir J. Gardner D. Engleheart, there are several little pictures which illustrate very completely the artist's power of pictorial effect and draughtsmanship. When occasion offered, Engleheart could do much more than paint or draw a face with style and accuracy. He could give expression and charm to the pose of a figure, and paint every detail with the delightful completeness which makes a picture as well as a portrait. There is, for example, a square miniature about 6 inches by 4½, representing a demure little maid in a big round hat, full-length, standing in a simple pose that is both child-like and bewitching; the grace with which she catches up her little frock full of flowers is quite Reynolds-like in inspiration, and the background with accessories, the big blue chair and dog, help the picture without detract-

MINIATURES

ing from the portrait. This miniature is of Lucy Engleheart, afterwards Mrs. Gardner. Another, equally clever and attractive, is a portrait of a great-aunt of Sir Gardner Engleheart, when a girl. It is all the more interesting because the features are not too regular; at the same time, the fair complexion and hair and the big blue hat assist in making it a very beautiful miniature. There is again displayed in this example a painter-like knowledge of effect in the contrasts of colour and tone. The kitten, perhaps, in this miniature, recalls Sir Joshua more than anything else: it is a Reynolds cat, bred with the typical Chinese-like angle of the eyes, a peculiarity which the great man did not hesitate to give to the children he painted, when his motive required an impish charm or Puck-like impudence of character. The miniature of a lady, illustrated on Plate xxxi., is from the Wallace Collection and until quite recently was attributed to Cosway. When Sir J. Gardner D. Engleheart examined it, he identified it at once as being by his ancestor, George Engleheart, as indeed all students of the art must agree. John Cox Dillman Engleheart also practised as a miniaturist, and exhibited his work at the Royal Academy between 1801 and 1828.

Henry Edridge is another eighteenth century miniature painter, worthy of mention as one of the best of the Cosway group. He was born in 1769 at Paddington, and was the son of a tradesman in St. James's, Westminster. At the age of fifteen he was apprenticed to William Pether, the mezzotint engraver and landscape painter. Edridge, encouraged by his master, followed his inclinations in drawing portraits, and soon became a student at the Royal Academy, and attracted the attention of Sir Joshua Reynolds. He first commenced his career as portrait painter in Dufour's Court, Golden Square, but his early portraits were generally executed in black lead pencil, a little flesh-colour or tint being afterwards added to the faces, somewhat in the manner of Cosway. Perhaps the most remarkable of his miniatures are the



PORTRAIT OF A LADY
BY GEORGE ENGLEHEART

THE DUCHESS OF PORTLAND
BY ANDREW PLIMER

MRS. UDNEY
BY MRS. MEE

JOHN PLOTT AND SAMUEL COTES

beautiful copies he made from the portraits of Sir Joshua Reynolds, possessing the breadth, colour, and force of the originals. On Plate xxxi. will be seen one of these copies reproduced. It is a portrait of T. T. Needham, F.R.S., from the Holburne Museum, Bath. In 1814 Edridge became a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, and six years later he was elected an Associate of the Royal Academy. Edridge also practised the art of landscape painting, and in this connection visited Rouen and other towns in Normandy. The British Museum possesses many portraits by this artist, including likenesses of himself, F. Bartolozzi, O. Humphry, R.A., T. Stothard, R.A., James Heath, A.R.A., and J. Nollekens. He exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1803 portraits of George III. and Queen Charlotte. He died in Margaret Street, Cavendish Square, in 1821, and was buried in Bushey churchyard.

John Plott and Samuel Cotes are two miniaturists who were not very well known, and both of whom commenced life in professions unconnected with art. John Plott was brought up as an attorney, and in his early days acted as clerk of the accounts for the maintenance of French prisoners quartered near Winchester, which was his native place, he having been born there in 1732. From this prosaic employment he turned to art, and became a pupil, first of Richard Wilson and then Nathaniel Hone, assisting the latter in painting his miniatures. Plott practised miniature painting with success both in London and Winchester. He exhibited at the Incorporated Society from 1764 to 1775, and frequently at the Royal Academy from 1772 until his death. He also executed a number of drawings illustrating objects of natural history, including a series for a book on *Land Snails*, which, however, remained unfinished. Late in life Plott was made a member of the corporation of his native town, and died there on October 27, 1803. He was an intimate friend of George Keate, the antiquary and artist, and some of their corre-

MINIATURES

spondence is now in the possession of Mr. G. B. Henderson of Bloomsbury Place.

Samuel Cotes, born in 1734, whose brother was Francis Cotes, R.A., was originally brought up in the profession of his father, Robert Cotes, a medical man. Samuel, however, encouraged by his brother's success as a painter, threw over the medical profession for the fine arts. With the assistance of his brother, he attained considerable reputation as a portrait painter, though never reaching the eminence that Francis succeeded in achieving. He was most successful with his crayon portraits, but also produced good enamels and fair specimens of miniature.

Samuel Cotes exhibited at the Incorporated Society of Artists from 1760 to 1789, and at the Royal Academy; but he retired from active life some years before his death, which took place at Chelsea in 1818. His second wife was Miss Sarah Sheppard, a lady of high accomplishments as an artist. The Duke of Devonshire possesses a miniature of a gentleman which is attributed to Cotes, and there are examples belonging to the Propert and Whitehead collections.

The few remaining miniature painters whom it is of interest to include here are not of much mark, though John Comerford the Irishman, and John Bogle the Scotsman, have both painted excellent portraits full of character and good drawing. Comerford practised in Dublin, and gained a considerable local reputation for his male portraits. He was born in 1773, dying in 1835. We have a really fine specimen of his work at South Kensington, in a miniature portrait of an old gentleman, and another of an English officer. Mr. Jeffery Whitehead possesses a portrait of Anne, Countess of Charlemont, and also eleven sketches on ivory by the same artist. There is also belonging to the Earl of Mayo a miniature of Mrs. Mary Tighe, the poetess. Bogle followed his profession in Scotland at the commencement of his career, and then came to London and con-

tinued to exhibit until 1792. Dr. Propert is of the opinion that he almost caught the smooth enamel-like surface of Smart, though hardly equalling him in beautiful colour. Judging from two small miniatures in the Victoria and Albert Museum by John Bogle, one of a lady and another of a gentleman, I can see no similitude between the two artists, though this painter is very well worthy of study. The tonality of the colour and general character in the examples just mentioned make one wish to see more of this little appreciated painter (Plate xxxi.).

Adam Buck and his brother Frederick were working at the end of the eighteenth century, the latter practising in Ireland. The former executed portraits in oil and crayon, and water-colour miniatures. There are some of his miniatures at Kensington, but they are not of much interest. He only exhibited once at the Royal Academy, in 1795. Edward Dayes, a pupil of William Pether the mezzotint engraver, became a well-known painter in water-colours, and there is a miniature of Mrs. Pope by him at South Kensington. Charles Fox is also represented by an example of his miniature work at this Museum. He began life as a bookseller at Bristol, but misfortune made him take to art, and he painted landscapes, portraits, and miniatures. The brothers John, William, and Edward Naish were miniature painters working at this time. A portrait by William is at Kensington. Also Abraham Daniel, a native of Bath, who died in 1803, practised miniature painting (see Plate xx.).

William Grimaldi, who was born in 1751, was a pupil of Worlidge. After having practised his art in several provincial towns, he settled in London in 1788. He was one of the many miniaturists to George III., the Duke and Duchess of York, and George IV. There are examples of his work at Windsor, but he must be considered as one of the minor miniaturists. He died in 1830.

Charles Hayter, who was born in Hampshire in 1761,

MINIATURES

was the son of an architect and builder, and started life in the same profession. He early developed a talent for drawing small pencil portraits, and so took up miniature painting in his native county. Later he came to London, and was well known for his water-colour miniatures on ivory, and crayon portraits on vellum. He exhibited a large number of miniatures at the Royal Academy between the years 1786 and 1832. Hayter taught the Princess Charlotte perspective, and was permitted to dedicate to her a book on the subject, entitled, *An Introduction to Perspective, adapted to the capacities of youth*. The Princess graciously authorised him to style himself professor of perspective and drawing to her Royal Highness. He died in 1835. His son, Sir George Hayter, also painted miniatures and portraits in crayon. He was appointed portrait-painter to the Princess Charlotte and Prince Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, but he subsequently made his name as an historical painter.

I shall now close the account of the late eighteenth century miniaturists by mentioning Sir Henry Raeburn, who not only commenced a brilliant career by painting miniatures, but also can claim to have instilled some of his fine qualities into Andrew Robertson, his fellow-countryman, one of the last really fine exponents of the art in the nineteenth century.

Raeburn was born in 1756, and was educated at Heriot's Hospital, Edinburgh, where his earliest essays in art were the caricatures of his classmates, and showed no particular precocity. At the age of fifteen he was apprenticed to a goldsmith and jeweller, Gilliland, of Edinburgh. Before he was sixteen, young Raeburn began to paint water-colour miniatures of his friends. It was commonly said that he had never even seen a picture when his miniatures began to attract attention, but this cannot be credited. His achievements excited his master's enthusiastic interest, and through his generosity the apprentice was introduced to David Martin, then the fashionable portrait-painter of Edinburgh.

SIR HENRY RAEBURN

Though Martin was but a poor painter, his pictures fired the ambition of the young artist, and led him to broaden the treatment of his miniatures. Martin can scarcely be said to have taken a very active interest in Raeburn's studies, and when he unjustly accused his pupil of selling one of the copies he had been allowed to make, they parted company for good.

The success of his miniatures led Raeburn to take to portraiture in oil entirely, though his lack of technical training hampered him seriously at the outset. He had to discover for himself most of the rudiments of his art, but proved himself made of the stern material which faces all difficulties, with the result that is so well known. From the first his work in oil was vigorous and broad. Unfortunately I have not seen any of the miniatures from his hand, but from the exceptional grasp of character displayed in his life-size portraits, they should be well worthy of the best painters 'in little.' He died after a week's illness in 1823, before he was able to finish two half-length portraits of Scott at which he was working.

CHAPTER VIII

THE ART OF RICHARD COSWAY AND HIS WIFE—
NATHANIEL AND ANDREW PLIMER AND SOME
WOMEN MINIATURISTS.

I HAVE perhaps reversed the order of things by giving an account of Richard Cosway's lesser contemporaries before considering himself. This will not detract from the latter, whilst it may help to place in a more favourable light our estimation of the former. If we are of those who possess a preconceived opinion that Cosway's art stands for all that is best and greatest in the miniature portrait, then we shall judge other work merely in its relationship to his. We shall consciously use our knowledge of Cosway's art as a standard by which to measure our criticism, and in so far as a work may answer to this test, it will be approved and commended. If, on the other hand—and this I think is the juster view—we consider him only as the brilliant leader of a distinct school, then we shall retain a more open mind and shall not have shut our eyes to other and nobler qualities.

Cosway was before all else an artist, and this is well illustrated in the way he created a convention which was peculiar to himself and in complete correspondence with his appreciation and facile expression of feminine beauty. It is this oneness or correspondence between the inspiration and the manner of expression that gives that spontaneity to his work which suggests facility and ease, and convinces us as only 'first intention' work can convince. It is, moreover, the quality which makes great art greater and lesser art great. Where the art

COSWAY OF FLEMISH ORIGIN

of Cosway fails is in the limitations of his inspiration or vision. He may be described as a man who had chained himself to a fetish—a standard of beauty—which denied him the power of freedom of vision. A face was to him but a mask, more or less capable of being conformed to his convention of the beautiful; but having been conformed, then he expressed himself with all the grace, facility, subtlety, and charm that were peculiar to his genius. The finished portrait entrances us, not as the masterly rendering of the essential characteristics of an individual, or the shrewdly expressed manners of a man, but rather as a charmingly phrased epigram which visualised the ideals of the artist. It is the artist we are in love with, when he would have us believe it is the sitter.

To review shortly the life of Cosway will, more than is commonly the case, help us to form a clearer idea of the man as artist. Whatever are the facts concerning the early years of his life—and there seems to exist some doubt about them—the most reliable and certainly the most probable, is the account given by Allan Cunningham—that he was sent to London when under twelve years of age to take lessons of Thomas Hudson, because he was a Devonshire man and had been the tutor of Sir Joshua Reynolds.

According to Cunningham, Cosway was born in 1740, though the exact date has been disputed. From his own account of himself he was of Flemish origin—an interesting and curious antecedent, in view of the truly idyllic character of his portraiture. One of his ancestors migrated here in the reign of Elizabeth, on account of the Duke of Alva's persecution in the Netherlands, when so many other Flemish dyers and dressers of woollen cloth fled to this country. Cosway's progenitor, being skilful in the manufacture of wool, established that industry at Tiverton, in Devonshire, and became very prosperous. His ancestors appear to have had considerable artistic appreciation and possessed a goodly number of pictures,

MINIATURES

including two by Rubens, which were doubtless brought over from Flanders. Young Cosway's early precocity at the age of seven met with no encouragement at first from his father, a master at the public school of Tiverton, who spoke of his son's devotion to his pencil as 'the idle pursuit of drawing.' Cunningham tells us, 'admonition and chastisement were employed without effect,' until by the persuasion of his uncle, who was Mayor of Tiverton, and a friend and early patron, Oliver Peard, a trader of the town, Cosway's father allowed him to go to London to study art. He did not stay long with Hudson, but instead attended Shipley's drawing-school, which was favoured by so many others like himself.

After the Society of Arts was founded, Cosway was the first to win a premium of £5, 5s. offered by them for a drawing, and in a few years he had won five other premiums of varying values. One of the earliest portraits in oil that he painted was of Shipley, the drawing-master, and this picture was his first exhibit in 1760 at the Society of Arts, and it is still to be seen hanging on the walls of that Society, having been presented by the artist. We know that very early in his career he was employed to make drawings of heads for fancy miniatures and snuff-boxes, for jewellers, so we can imagine at this period Cosway was not too well off. He was in the throes of that transition which, as Smith tells us, was to convert him 'from one of the dirtiest of boys to one of the smartest of men.' In the year 1761 he commenced miniature painting, and exhibited four miniatures and one portrait in oil at the Free Society.

There exists an exceedingly interesting group of miniatures, belonging to Mr. Jonathan Rashleigh of Menabilly, Cornwall, consisting of thirteen portraits of ancestors of his family. They are small ivory miniatures of one and three-quarter inches, with the exception of the portrait of Jonathan Rashleigh, born in 1690, and ancestor to the present owner. This is an enamel miniature and has been attributed to Bone. It is of a man between forty



Miss Lanyon by R. A. Dadd. Picture Palace, London. D. P. 1814

"Youth loving her charms, as old age advances"

FROM A PENCIL DRAWING BY RICHARD DADD (1814)

COSWAY AT BERKELEY STREET

and fifty, in a powdered periwig, white stock, and a brown velvet coat. The miniatures of his wife, Mary Clayton, and their eleven children have always been considered to be by Cosway, and would therefore give us some of his earliest paintings in miniature. They are obviously prior to the manner that he adopted later. In place of the light, airy cloud effects in silvery greys and pure blues, we have solid backgrounds rather dark in tone; and instead of powdered coiffures, daintily dressed and curled, the hair in the girls' portraits is simply done and painted in its natural colour.

The year 1770 gives the earliest record of Cosway having exhibited at the Royal Academy, and from that time he continued to do so until 1787. Then there was a lapse of twelve years, when he again sent at irregular intervals. He seems to have sent in all a little over forty miniatures to this gallery during his life. The young artist commenced his professional practice at Orchard Street, Portman Square. He won admittance as a student to the Royal Academy Schools in 1769, and a year later he was sufficiently well known to gain academic honours and was elected an Associate, the following year, 1771, being promoted to full membership. At this time he resided at 4 Berkeley Street, Berkeley Square, and he remained there sixteen years, during the latter part of which period he married. In 1784, Mr. and Mrs. Cosway took up their palatial abode at Pall Mall, and continued there in the height of their prosperity. This house had previously been tenanted by many artists,—Jervas, Astley, and Nathaniel Hone had all lived there; and Gainsborough at one time occupied a portion of the building.

It was not until Cosway had taken up his residence in Berkeley Street that his name became really well known. During his sojourn in Orchard Street he was only in the initial stage of his success, and occupied his evenings by giving drawing-lessons at Parr's drawing-school, at the same time studying at the Duke of Richmond's gallery of antique casts. He had, however,

MINIATURES

already attracted some attention by his eccentric vanity. At Berkeley Street, Cosway's success was well assured, and he paraded his prosperity in the manner of his dress and his mode of life.

His miniature of the notorious Mrs. Fitzherbert gave him his first lift into court patronage. It was greatly approved by the Prince of Wales, who with his royal brothers visited the artist's studio, and were duly followed by all the brilliant frequenters of his court. Cosway was appointed miniature painter to His Royal Highness, and became the vogue. His love of show and admiration, his passion for notoriety, stimulated him in developing a very keen business faculty, which not only governed his mode of life but also his manner of art. As Cunningham very plainly expresses it, 'To rise from indigence to affluence, and step out of the company of indifferent daubers into that of lords and ladies of high degree, could not be accomplished, Cosway imagined, without putting on airs of superiority, and a dress rivalling that of an Eastern ambassador.' His black servant, his foppish style of dress on all occasions, early inspired many jests at his expense, including the famous caricature by Mat Darley of 'the Macaroni miniature painter,' which title stuck to him all his life. Cosway met these aspersions with plenty of spirit when occasion offered, and though he was particularly sensitive, he doubtless knew that jealousy formed a considerable incentive to them. It was after his marriage that the full tide of his magnificence began. The Berkeley Street house became altogether too small for the Cosways to receive their numerous and influential *clientèle*; they therefore moved to the central portion of the great house in Pall Mall, which had been built for the Duke of Schomberg, and has since been annexed by the War Office. From this time their life became a continued succession of ostentatious displays. Mrs. Cosway, who has been described as a 'golden haired, languishing Anglo-Italian, graceful to affectation and highly accomplished,

THE COSWAYS AT STRATFORD PLACE

especially in music,' acted her part of social queen to perfection. The gorgeous receptions and Sunday evening concerts, patronised by the Prince of Wales and the entire Carlton House set, including all who for any cause whatever were the pets of a fickle and elegant society, must have been a fruitful source of commissions. Cosway adopted without reserve the manners of this society, and moulded his life and genius to ingratiate himself and his art into its favour. This throws an interesting side-light on the motives which impelled him. These brilliant assemblies of fashionable dames and dandies pampered his vain sense of self-importance, and he in turn gratified theirs with his subtle and skilful art of flattery. But the relationship between the artist and his patrons was artificial in the extreme, for the latter laughed in secret at his folly, and derided that which it was their pleasure to enjoy. What wonder is it that a life such as this should have been productive of that lack of sincerity which, in spite of all that is so admirable and masterly, prevents the miniature portraits by Cosway from having a higher historical and biographical value?

So rapidly did the Cosways' circle of admirers increase, that even the Pall Mall house would not fulfil the requirements of this ambitious pair, and once again they moved to one that was more roomy, at the corner of Stratford Place, Oxford Street.

Outside, a figure of a lion surmounted the pediment, which gave occasion to a petty wag, who pinned some feeble witticisms on the front door referring to the lion without and the monkey within. The over-sensitiveness of Cosway was unable to treat this with the contempt it deserved, and he immediately removed to No. 20 in the same street. This new house was fitted up in truly princely style, containing every luxury, every imaginable conceit in the way of expensive bric-a-brac and furniture. Smith says of it: 'I regret drawings were not made of the general appearance of each department; for many of the rooms were more like scenes of enchantment pencilled

MINIATURES

by a poet's fancy, than anything perhaps before displayed in a domestic habitation.'

This magnificence unfortunately was not to continue. The phenomenal success which attended this display of prosperity had reached its climax, and it needed very little to make such a gilded palace of cards tumble to the ground. Towards the end of the century there is no doubt Cosway expressed himself too openly in sympathy with the French revolutionists, and thus succeeded in completely estranging the king, who had never been particularly partial to the painter, and it is not surprising that the Prince of Wales was little inclined to overlook, even in so popular an artist, such anti-royalist sentiments. The prince began to remember that his position as heir to the crown would necessitate a reconstitution of the society of which he had been such a gay leader. When the infirmities of George III. rendered it necessary to have a Prince Regent, Cosway found himself left entirely in the cold; and lacking both the graces of a courtier and the inclination to humble his pride, he made no attempt to retrieve his influence with the prince or to regain his lost favour with the court.

Although Cosway's great success, together with his vanity, were the cause of much jealousy and no little satire on the part of his friends and enemies, he was of an open and joyous disposition, generous to all who were in need, and, as the testimony of Andrew Robertson makes clear, without any of the petty professional jealousy which has marred the character of lesser men. His pupils spoke of him with much regard and affection, and it is clear that his faults were superficial and obvious, and likely therefore to be exaggerated by those of his contemporaries who chose to look no deeper than the surface.

Without going the length of ridiculing the Cosways, as Miss Clayton so amusingly contrives to, in her lives of *English Female Artists*, there is plenty of evidence to show that the envy and malice of their enemies had some



MRS. BUTLER (FANNY KEMBLE)

ELIZABETH FOSTER, DUCHESS OF DEVONSHIRE

BY RICHARD COSWAY

COSWAY'S DEATH

excuse in fact. The ostentatious manner of their life, the position which they aped, were out of harmony with the dignity of their art. Whilst the income which Cosway made was, to use his own expression, bigger than that of all his contemporaries put together, he spent it at an equal rate, and would augment it by the purchase and sale of 'old masters' he had touched up himself, or by an advantageous deal in the bric-a-brac which adorned his elaborately furnished house.

Cosway lived at Stratford Place until the year of his death in 1821, and many of his clients continued to patronise him. Circumstances, however, gradually helped to make a wreck of his life. First his wife became ill, and was forced to travel on the Continent for several years; then their only daughter died, and finally Cosway's own health broke up, and he became subject to the most fantastic hallucinations. The last years of his life were softened by the devotion of his wife; and when paralysis destroyed the use of his right hand, and their income was much impaired, they decided to sell all their belongings. In the early part of 1821 they made their last move to a modest little house in the Edgware Road, and the following July Cosway died suddenly from a stroke of paralysis, whilst driving out with his old friend Miss Udney. He was buried in Marylebone Church, and his wife erected a marble group to his memory, designed by Westmacott. It was placed on the north wall under the gallery of Marylebone Church, with an epitaph by her brother-in-law Combe ('Syntax').

Miss Clayton says that when Maria Hadfield married Cosway, the latter 'was at this time a remarkable man on the highroad to wealth and distinction, a miniature painter of the first class, smiled and simpered upon by titled ladies and conceited Sir Plumes who liked being flattered by his craftily caressing pencil. He had devised a clever tricky way of daintily touching in miniatures so as to give an appearance of exquisite finish, with very little real work.' This is picturesque criticism, but a little too piquant to be

MINIATURES

accurate. Cosway's miniatures are free, facile, and dexterous; they are first-intentioned in their delicate inspiration, no laboriousness mars the playful grace of his mode of expression; but at their best they give us much more than a mere 'appearance of exquisite finish.' They give us the truest and rarest form of finish—an innate knowledge of the simplest means of expressing his intention, without plaguing us with minute and unessential details which would only belittle the whole inspiration. If to do this required very little real work, it required a great deal of real genius. More than this, Cosway's touch was sincere and full of an individual feeling which cannot be termed tricky, or even conventional, in the vulgar sense of the word. His manner of generalising nature, so that all his portraits show almost a family resemblance, is certainly a great weakness, but his method of drawing and painting was quite excellent and full of style.

Cosway's output of drawings and miniatures was enormous: his execution was extraordinarily rapid, if we are to believe what he said himself. When he sat down to dinner he would boast that he had despatched during the day twelve or fourteen sitters; but we must accept this statement with reserve, remembering that the number of sittings required to finish even a slight miniature must have been several. His early and life-long study of the antique helped appreciably to form his style, which may be said to reflect, through the self-consciousness of contemporary modes, a certain classic feeling of line, proportion, and grace. The exquisite taste he always shows in the arrangement and technical expression of his draperies is perhaps more indicative of the artist's greatness than anything else—whether it is a loose, diaphanous veil lightly thrown over the head, or the crimped folds of a muslin chemise, we see the same deft skill. Nothing is thoughtless, nothing is wanton; the faintest brush-mark is placed with as much care and easy confidence as the fullest; dexterity is never allowed to take advantage of discretion or good taste. His paint-



MRS. FITZHERBERT

BY RICHARD COSWAY

(Mounted in Cosway's green leather pocket-case)

COSWAY'S PENCIL PORTRAITS

ing of hair is a happy combination of the sculptor's and the painter's art ; it possesses the soft, radiating appreciation of line, with a classic uniformity of mass, crowning the head like a bishop's tiara, or lightly caressing the rounded contours of neck and shoulders.

In the height of his fame and popularity Cosway's clients increased to such an extent that even his power of rapid work could not keep pace with the demand for his portraits. Here again we find Cosway equal to the emergency, for he established a slighter form of portrait—the 'stained pencil-drawing,' which he was able to produce in an incredibly short time. The interest of these portraits is second only to that of his miniatures ; they sometimes have even more freedom of touch, and the hair and draperies are suggested with a delightful ease and simple manner of expression. The tinted drawings are very unequal in their technical merits, the faces at times are painted in a very small, hard manner, but the best of them display considerable grace and skill in the pose of the figures and disposition of the slight accessories. These slight portraits had an appreciable effect on the style of his miniatures, for we find that most of the latter which were painted during the pencil period are freer in manipulation and simpler in their scheme of colour ; the flesh, hair, and draperies seemingly painted in a uniformly delicate warm grey, the flesh-tints and local colouring being added afterwards.

It is impossible to mention here the numbers of existing miniatures, known to be by Cosway, in the possession of many well-known collectors and enthusiasts. I will, however, refer to the very charming ones which the royal collection at Windsor contains. The unfinished one of Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire, which Mr. Richard Holmes, the librarian, was fortunate in being able to add to that collection, shows a character in the drawing which is remarkable and truthful ; and the magnificent pencil-drawing of the three princesses is unique in its grace of composition and lovely balance of line. Two of the

MINIATURES

figures are seated on a settee, and the third is standing on the right-hand side; they are full-length and draped in the full soft skirts and low bodices which Cosway knew so well how to delineate. This drawing brings home to us the strength of Cosway's technique. With a consummate ease of touch and flow of execution, every line is an essential to the rhythm of the drawing. Like delicate threads of a web which enchain the portrait, his playful point weaves its magic grace into every detail of the picture, at times scarcely visible in its faint delineation of a soft fold, now more insistent in the radiating curves of the hair, the arched eyebrow, or sparkling eye. His methods are loose, free, and feeling, yet expressive and inspired; nothing harsh, nothing angular, nothing gross is allowed to obtrude itself upon the scene.

Cosway produced some very dainty compositions of a poetic and classical nature. They were done either in pencil and ink, with a slight wash of colour, or in pencil alone. We see in these drawings his study of Correggio and classic art, and though they display considerable idea of construction and balance of composition and line, they lack a vigorous grasp of form. I am fortunate in being able to illustrate a very beautiful composition sketch which, I believe, has never been reproduced before, and belongs to Sir Tollemache Sinclair (Plate xxiii.). It is one of several possessed by the same collector, and has much interest for the student of Cosway. The subject, as will be seen, represents the poetic suggestion of 'youth having her charms stolen from her, one by one, as age advances,' and it seems peculiarly appropriate to include it as the work of a painter who was so sensitive to feminine loveliness.

Another of the illustrations shows an unique possession of Sir Tollemache Sinclair. It is the pocket-book which Cosway used always to carry about with him, into one side of which was mounted the portrait of Mrs. Fitzherbert, surrounded by its leather framing (Plate xxv.). The pocket-book itself is green leather, de-



LADY HARCOURT, WIFE OF THIRD EARL
BY RICHARD COSWAY

PORTRAIT OF A GENTLEMAN
BY ANDREW PLIMER

ANNE COPLEY, LADY MANNERS
BY RICHARD COSWAY

PORTRAIT OF A GIRL
BY SAMUEL SHELLEY (?)

RICHARD COSWAY'S MINIATURES

signed to carry miniatures or ivories, and it has Cosway's address in Stratford Place printed in gold upon it.

The portrait of Mrs. Butler, also illustrated (Plate xxiv.), is a sketchy and sensitive piece of painting. In many ways, I think it shows far more feeling than the more direct and easy method of work shown in other examples. The reproduction hardly gives the peculiarly tentative manner of its execution, but we can see it is full of exquisite subtlety of tone and colour.

The miniature of Lady Manners, who was the grandmother of Sir Tollemache Sinclair, is of quite a different style. It is most minutely finished, tight and small in its technique; the half-tints are somewhat purplish in tone, and it was undoubtedly painted before Cosway attained the greater freedom of the pencil portraits.

Elizabeth Foster, Duchess of Devonshire (Plate xxiv.), is a most characteristic piece of Cosway's work—the freedom of touch, simplicity of handling and colour, are all testimony to this. The hair, shadows, and drapery are painted in with a sepia grey: it is the delicacy of the modelling and the charming relativeness of the tones which give the pearly colour sense. Here we have the strong darks in the eyes, the flaky blue cloud background, and the faint carnations on the cheeks, which become more insistent on the lips; also that unique effeminate sweetness of the handling. It is part of the necessities of the process that the reproductions in colour fail somewhat to catch the delicate differences which I have wished to point out, though I think any reader who has some practical knowledge of the art of miniature will be able to appreciate the points here alluded to. These three last named miniatures belong to the collection of Mr. Henry Drake.

The portrait of the Prince Regent is interesting as showing the first stages of Cosway's method (Plate xxvii.). We have Dr. Propert's authority for believing that genuine Cosway miniatures are always signed on the back and never on the face of the painting. As a rule

MINIATURES

the signature is of the elaborate description, which may be seen in facsimile on the pencil-drawing reproduced. There are many miniatures extant, undeniably by Cosway, that have no signature at all, but those I have seen signed on the face certainly cannot seriously lay claim to genuineness—though owners are very loth to believe they are spurious. A word may be said about Mrs. Robinson, the pretty subject of another miniature on Plate xxvii. As is well known, she was an actress, and first favourite in the affections of the prince before Mrs. Fitzherbert. She was painted many times by the great painters. Sir Joshua produced two portraits of her—one is possessed by Lord Granville, and the other is now in the Wallace collection at Hertford House. Cosway painted her twice. Hoppner, Gainsborough, and Romney all immortalised this winsome lady, who became popularly known as 'Perdita.' It was whilst she was acting in this part that His Royal Highness fell in love with her, and the actress subsequently received from the hands of Lord Malden a miniature of the Prince Regent, painted by Meyer the enamellist. Within the case was a small heart cut in paper, on one side of which was written, 'Je ne change qu'en mourant,' on the other, 'Unalterable to my Perdita through life.'

This miniature of Mrs. Robinson has been attributed to many painters, and is quite excellent, but I must leave its authenticity still in doubt.

To omit to say something of the art of Mrs. Cosway would be hardly doing that clever and fascinating woman sufficient justice. Whatever may have been written by others with the object of depreciating the reputation of this abnormally prosperous pair, it is certain that few women could have entered more sympathetically into the ambitions, the vanities, and the vexations of spirit which must have been the essence of their social existence.

Maria Cosway was the daughter of an Englishman named Hadfield, who had emigrated to Italy and realised a fortune by keeping an hotel much frequented by English



George IV.
BY R. COSWAY.



Princess Charlotte.
BY A. CHALON.

Mrs. Robinson ("Cordelia")
UNKNOWN.

MARIA COSWAY

travellers. Maria was educated in a convent, where she developed considerable ability in music and drawing, and was consequently sent to Rome to study. There she became acquainted with several artists, and amongst them Theresa da Maron, sister of Mengs—remarkable for her paintings in miniature, crayon drawings, and enamels—Wright of Derby, Fuseli, and other well-known artists.

When her father died Maria wished to take the veil, but under the persuasion of her mother they left Italy, and with her sister Charlotte and her brother, journeyed to London. Some writers say that the Hadfields came to England at the invitation of Angelica Kauffmann; in any case, Maria soon gained the friendship of Angelica and was introduced to Richard Cosway. Richard's personal beauty could not have helped him much to create an impression, in spite of the dandified embellishments of his exterior, for we are told that he was insignificant and ugly, and quite unlike his own portraits of himself. He fell in love with Maria Hadfield, who was then in the bloom of youth, and, as Miss Clayton describes her, 'with a fresh, delicate face, enframed by a quantity of blonde hair, dressed in the mode of the day. The large soft eyes, the artless expression of the sweet countenance, gave Maria an enchanting air of innocence, most bewitching.' From the portraits which exist of Mrs. Cosway, this cannot be too flattering a description.

It was soon after being elected an R.A. that Cosway married, and it is said that for some time afterwards Mrs. Cosway was kept by her husband in complete seclusion, because of her youth and want of knowledge of the English language and the manners and customs of fashionable society. In the year 1781 she exhibited her first pictures at the Royal Academy, three in number, 'Rinaldo,' 'Creusa appearing to Æneas,' and 'Like Patience on a monument, smiling at grief.' She continued to exhibit almost yearly at the Royal Academy until 1800. Mrs. Cosway completed her reputation as an artist by her portrait of the beautiful Duchess of

MINIATURES

Devonshire in the character of Cynthia. This reputation, some writers tell us, threatened to compete with that of her husband, until, with his usual diplomacy, he forbade his wife to work for money. He, however, encouraged her musical gifts, and in every way keenly appreciated her assistance in drawing to their receptions crowds of the brilliant and flashy frequenters of Society's playgrounds.

Amongst Mrs. Cosway's immediate circle were the Duchess of Devonshire, the Hon. Mrs. Seymour Damer, the sculptor, the Countess of Ailesbury, and others. The crowd of patrons included the Prince of Wales, Horace Walpole, and indeed most of the distinguished persons of the day.

Mrs. Cosway's absence abroad for three years was the excuse for many spiteful suggestions, but they have no foundation in fact. The devoted tenderness of the wife, when her husband was broken by mental and physical disease, and the magnificence of the halcyon days of their prosperity had departed, is sufficient answer to all detractors.

After her husband's death, Maria Cosway left England for her native Italy, and settled at Lodi. Here she became the Superior of a convent which she had successfully planned some years previously, and devoted the last years of her life to the training and education of the young novices of her religious college. The last that was heard of her, according to Samuel Redgrave, she was seen heading a procession of her pupils, going to the cathedral, bearing a long ivory cross in her hand, and draped in a sky-blue robe spotted with velvet stars. This is a fitting scene on which to draw the curtain of her eventful life.

I am able to give three examples of the work of Mrs. Cosway in miniature, and they convey to us a good idea of her ability in this medium, but quite refute the opinions of those who have credited her with greater talent than her husband (Plate xxviii.).

With regard to the lives of the two Plimers, Dr. Propert asks, 'Why is it that so little mention is made in any



PORTRAIT OF A LADY
 BY MARIA COSWAY

MISS OGLE
 BY RICHARD COSWAY



PORTRAIT OF A LADY
 BY MARIA COSWAY

PORTRAIT OF A GIRL
 BY MARIA COSWAY

ANDREW AND NATHANIEL PLIMER

work on art, of Andrew Plimer?' In a footnote it is added that Andrew Plimer was born at Bridgewater, December 21, 1764, and christened in the parish church. A later writer states that he was the son of a clockmaker at Wellington, in Shropshire, and was born in 1763, and that his elder brother, Nathaniel, was born in 1757. It is sufficient for us to know that both probably were pupils of Cosway, and caught many of the mannerisms, if little of the art of their master. Andrew set up a studio for himself in Golden Square in 1786, Nathaniel at the same time starting his career in Maddox Street, Hanover Square. Both brothers exhibited irregularly at the Royal Academy, Andrew from 1786 to 1819, and Nathaniel from 1787 to 1801. At the commencement of their careers, the elder brother, Nathaniel, appears to have been the more prolific of the two, but later in life all information with regard to him seems to be lost. Andrew painted in several mediums and a variety of manners, but his attainments in the wider field of oil-painting are not distinguished by any exceptional qualities. His miniatures, as far as it is possible to compare them with those of his brother, are decidedly better in their technical qualities and skill. His best known work is the graceful miniature group of the three daughters of Sir John Rushout, known as 'The Three Graces.' This is undoubtedly full of beauty in its composition and feeling for line, but it quite fails in the drawing of the figures, which possess no substance and display no real knowledge of form. A far finer piece of painting is the portrait of Sir John Sinclair, of which I am able to give an illustration (Plate xxix.).

It is not surprising that the work of the Plimers has been so much confused with Cosway's, and yet when once the peculiarities of these artists are known and studied, their productions are as distinct as those of any other painters of the period. It is only necessary to see a number of the miniatures of Andrew Plimer together, to grasp at once his virtues and his limitations. He has

MINIATURES

learned all the lessons which Cosway could teach him in producing a pleasing and refined effect, under certain fixed and unalterable rules of drawing, pose, and colour. His distinction of style depends on the simple breadth of effect of light and shade, and a graceful manner of drawing, but his mannerisms are only too evident and become very tiresome. The pose, position, and inclination of the head are mere repetitions. The features, too, seem to conform themselves to a type and vary very slightly within its limited range. However much Plimer's miniatures may charm us in the present day, because of their old-time graceful effeminacy, they are altogether too mannered to be satisfactory as portraits; the accentuation of the eyes in size and strength of colour, when seen repeated in a number of examples, becomes almost vulgar.

I have seen some few of this painter's miniatures having other and more serious qualities, and suggesting more of the force and character of nature. The portrait of the Duke of Devonshire, belonging to Mr. E. M. Hodgkins, is one of these, and seems to contradict in every particular the set rules which apply to the routine portrait by Plimer. Here we do not get the prevailing blue; even the sky is modified, and the bold shadow thrown across the lower half of the figure is original and successful; the pose is dignified, the scale of the miniature is smaller, and the head is turned to the left, instead of to the right, as is the case in almost all others. It has much of the quality of an Engleheart. If we have cause to think that Cosway generalised too much in his form and proportions, we have much more reason for considering that Plimer's portraits suffer from this defect, and in addition they are much harder and more mechanical in their execution. Andrew Plimer possessed great facility, but it was a trained facility and lacked the spontaneity of Cosway's touch. He was partial to hatch-work in the backgrounds and costumes, which can never give anything but an academic quality. His colouring seldom goes



PORTRAIT OF A GENTLEMAN
 BY RICHARD COSWAY



CHARLES HEATH
 BY ANDREW ROBERTSON
(Signed)



SIR JOHN SINCLAIR
 BY ANDREW PLIMER

THE PLIMERS

beyond a pretty tinting, with a tendency to greenness in the half-tones ; yet, as I have said, there is style and a certain distinction in his work which has been borrowed from his master.

I have been critical in my judgment, but, I believe, no less just, and it is more helpful to express an opinion which is thoughtful and critical, than one which is enthusiastic without true appreciation. The reader has an opportunity to compare in this volume the work of the several masters, and can form his own judgment as to whether my divergence from accepted opinions has any justification in fact. Let him study the miniature of the Duchess of Portland, by Plimer, side by side with the portrait of 'La Belle Stuart,' by Cooper. This comparison will surely lead him to ask whether Plimer can really be considered a good draughtsman, depending, as he did, so much on a recipe of form in the features and contours of a face.

Nathaniel Plimer's work differs only from his younger brother's in its feebler reflection of the same characteristics, though I have seen one or two miniatures by him that are preferable to the stereotyped examples of Andrew's work. A portrait of a gentleman, belonging to Mr. A. de Pass, is one of these. The technique is less hard and the eyes smaller and not so conventional. Much might be added to insist on the many weaknesses inherent in the miniatures of these two brothers, but their greatest failings are undoubtedly the entire lack of a knowledge of form, as a painter understands the term, and an absolutely meretricious handling of the relative values. They appear to have reduced their art down to a mathematical table, in which each line was represented by an unalterable scale, on no account to be digressed from. Their sitters' characteristics were made to conform themselves to this scale—with the result that their personalities were submerged in a narrow and mechanical convention. That this convention was based upon certain obvious laws of prettiness, is not to

MINIATURES

be denied, but it is quite impossible to consider the results as serious attempts at portraiture.

Andrew Plimer in his method of work was dexterous and direct, often commencing his miniatures in a monotone of warm grey, and making use of a free pencil line, which can be easily distinguished by a careful examination of the finished work. He also had frequent recourse to the scraper in the hair and other accessories.

It is often asserted that there is little or no opportunity for composition in the small miniature portrait, and this may be true in respect to the more complex balance of line and form which is possible where a full-length figure or figures are represented, but there are great possibilities of design and arrangement, as I have already pointed out, in reference to earlier schools. The pose of a head, the fashion of the coiffure, the turn of the shoulders and the drapery which covers them, all have a variety of possibilities, and before all, the proportionate size between the head and bust, and the defined limits of the square, oval, or round ivory. The fraction of an inch may make or mar the perfect balance of design in these small portraits. Good taste, or a natural intuition for the general fitness of things, and sense of decoration, are worth more than paragraphs of precept. We can, however, train our eyes to appreciate the difference between an ill-posed and badly-designed miniature and one that possesses a grace and dignity which become the subject. It is interesting, in the light of this phase of the subject, to compare the Holbein, the Cooper, and the Cosway schools. The first more often affected the circle and square forms, and within these they placed the head and shoulders either square to the spectator or in profile, rarely, if ever, giving any turn to the head or eyes. Even when painted three-quarter face, the figure was shown at the same angle. This school, however, thoroughly understood the art of decoration and proportioning the figure to the limits of the vellum, and contrived to treat the

SOME WOMEN MINIATURISTS

stiff and quaint costume in a way that was pleasing and expressive.

The Cooper school, on the other hand, preferred a broad oval, and at once shows us a much more matured development in the treatment. It had grasped the value of relief, and light and shade, and therefore realised its altered possibilities. We find the heads are turned on the shoulders, and the eyes often turned in the head, but there is no attempt at 'pose.' We might describe the attitude of these Cromwellian and Stuart people as one of self-respecting dignity, or a stern self-consciousness of worth; nothing finicking, vain or sentimental weakens the strong delineation of these portraits. The ladies possess grace, but it is the grace of a dignified carriage of the head, not a coquettish, frivolous, or languishing inclination.

The Cosway school chose the oval almost exclusively, and their appreciation for design, as shown by the best painters, has much charming grace, but is often affected, conventional, and sentimental. In the turn of the head, and the angle which it takes with the shoulders, we often see a self-consciousness which is vain and simpering. At the same time, the finest examples of this school are well worthy of study, for their dainty *naïveté* of pose and the airy lightness of the handling of the relative tones. Cosway himself at times almost achieved perfection in these qualities, but how near this perfection is to mere trickery is exemplified in the work of his weaker disciples.

It is a little indicative of the tendency of the art of miniature at this time to find so many female amateurs who competed not unfavourably with the professional workers of the period. Probably the example of the popular lady artists, Angelica Kauffmann, Mrs. Cosway, and the Hon. Mrs. Damer, stimulated the idea in others of the fair sex. Anne Flodsone, who is best known as Mrs. Mee, was the eldest daughter of John Flodsone, a painter, and is perhaps the most important lady minia-

MINIATURES

turist of that day. She worked at the end of the century, and commenced exhibiting at the Royal Academy in 1804, and was extensively patronised by George IV. There are many examples of her later work at Windsor, but they will not compare with the earlier examples. It is hardly correct to class Mrs. Mee as an amateur, inasmuch as having to contribute to the support of a large family after her father's death, she practised as a miniature painter from a very early age. South Kensington has a miniature of Mrs. Margaret Deering, and at the Holburne Museum, Bath, there is a portrait of Mrs. Udney, the friend of the Cosways, both by this artist. The last named is illustrated on Plate XXII. There are also several other specimens known to exist in private hands. Mrs. Mee lived to a great age and died in 1851.

Charlotte Jones commenced exhibiting in 1801, and painted the portrait of the Prince of Wales several times. I have not seen any of her miniatures, but Dr. Propert calls her a very good artist, correct in colour and drawing.

Miss Frances Reynolds, the sister of Sir Joshua Reynolds, painted miniatures as an amusement, we are told, and Dr. Johnson said he sat to her ten times. He knew little about painting, and much as he admired the fair artist, his scrupulous veracity prevented him from complimenting her on her work, and he called the finished miniature 'Johnson's grimly ghost.' Sir Joshua Reynolds's niece, Miss Theophile Palmer, afterwards Mrs. Gwatkin, painted miniatures successfully. Dr. Propert possessed a miniature of Mrs. Robinson as Perdita, by Miss 'Offie' Palmer, and Mr. Jeffery Whitehead has a portrait of the latter by Ozias Humphry.

Lady Lucan was an accomplished miniaturist who copied the works of the Olivers, Hoskins, and Cooper, and also painted many original portraits. Lady Spencer, a pupil of Sir Joshua; Lady Templetown, Miss Crewe, and Lady Diana Beauclerc, daughter of the Duke of Marlborough, were all good artists, and drew and designed

ANGELICA KAUFFMANN

subjects for Bartolozzi and Wedgwood. Angelica Kauffmann herself is reputed to have painted in miniature. The Baroness Burdett-Coutts has a group of two sisters very much in her manner of work, Mr. Jeffery Whitehead owns two others, one of which is a portrait of the artist, and Mr. Cyril Davenport possesses an ancestral portrait of one of the family of Clinton which has always been attributed to Miss Kauffmann, but the academic quality of the drawing would suggest that it was an early work.

CHAPTER IX

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND THE DECLINE OF THE ART

THE latter end of the renaissance of miniature painting is characterised by a completely different style from the one Cosway had made fashionable. Andrew Robertson, who in his day was called 'the father of his art,' took quite a new model for his inspiration; he was not of those who were infatuated by the Cosway craze. To quote his own words, 'they are pretty things, but not pictures—no nature, colouring, or force. They are too much like each other to be like the originals, and if a man has courage to deviate from the model, we all know how easy it is to paint pretty things, when he can paint smooth without torturing it into a likeness of a bad subject. . . . I have done some things lately in Cosway's style, and I see it does not require a conjurer to succeed in it—a *little* genius, knowledge of the figure and drapery is all that is necessary.' Robertson shows us the antithesis to all this. Like Samuel Cooper of old, he grasped the soul of his sitter, or to quote Stevenson's criticism of the painter from whom Robertson learned so much, 'he looked people shrewdly between the eyes, surprised their manners in their face, and had possessed himself of what was essential in their character before they had been many minutes in his studio.'

It is curious that the three principal miniaturists of the nineteenth century were Scotsmen—Robertson, Ross, and Thorburn. In this chronological order they represent the decline of the art, for Thorburn saw miniature painting almost completely extinguished by photography.



Princess Amelia
BY ANDREW ROBERTS.



The Princess Royal
BY OZIAS HUMPHREY

ANDREW ROBERTSON

Andrew Robertson was born at Aberdeen on October 14, 1777, and was the youngest of five sons of William Robertson of Drumnahoy. He was at first intended for the medical profession, and took a degree at Marischal College, Aberdeen; then the support of his family devolving upon him, he gave up medicine and adopted art as a better means of fulfilling his responsibilities. He tells us that in 1794, at the age of sixteen, he went to Edinburgh to study landscape- and scene-painting under Nasmyth, but, 'being very desirous of seeing Raeburn's pictures, I bravely knocked at his door, armed with a shilling for his servant, requesting to see the pictures. . . . Presently the man (Raeburn) himself made his appearance, palette and brushes in hand, each a yard long, for he painted at arm's length.' After having shown the famous portrait painter some miniatures which he had in his pocket, he was invited to come and copy any of the portraits he liked, and a small room was especially prepared for him to work in. He then tells us he had the audacity to alter the background of the portrait in the copy he was making, much to the amusement of Raeburn, who, however, seems to have subsequently adopted his pupil's interpretation in his own picture.

It was the friendship and help of Sir Henry Raeburn in these early days that inspired Robertson and formed his style, and although he became acquainted later with many other painters, his admiration for the Scottish artist never weakened. On returning to Aberdeen Robertson started the practice of miniature painting, but for some time was obliged to add to a precarious income by painting scenery for local theatres.

Robertson had the happy propensity of making friends with every one with whom he came in contact, and this was of great service to him through life. In the actual technical part of his profession he owed much to the instruction of his elder brother Archibald, who wrote long letters from America advising him on the best methods and principles of study in every detail, and

MINIATURES

these are published *in extenso* in the interesting *Life and Letters of Andrew Robertson*, edited by his daughter.

In 1801, by the advice of his professional friends, Robertson determined to go to London and study at the Royal Academy schools. Up to this time he had painted no less than four hundred and twenty-seven miniatures, but had never received more than four guineas for a portrait, and had painted many for considerably less. Through the interest of William Hamilton, R.A., and Martin Shee, R.A., he was entered as a student of the Royal Academy schools, and in the following year he exhibited his first miniatures in its galleries, sending no less than six. Sir Benjamin West, the President, took great interest in the rising young artist, encouraging him by praise and advice, and sitting to him for his portrait. This picture was engraved by G. Dawe.

Martin Shee and his friend Mr. Coxe expressed themselves freely on the prospects of young Robertson, and 'declared the want of a good miniature painter in London, to paint in sterling style, founded on the great masters' works; there are oceans of people who take likenesses merely, and many that paint in a very pretty style, but no sterling good miniature artist. . . . Cosway and Shelley, they allowed, had their merits.' Later, in the same letter, Robertson tells us that Shee said, 'as to the miniature painters, there is not one of them that can draw.' In the latter end of his first year in London Robertson painted several miniatures at five guineas and one at eleven, and from this time he rapidly commenced to establish a *clientèle* of his own, notwithstanding the competition of such fashionable exponents of the art as Cosway and Shelley. During his life he exhibited at the Royal Academy a very large number of miniatures, often sending as many as eight or more in one year.

In December 1805 Robertson was appointed miniature painter to H.R.H. the Duke of Sussex, and two years later was honoured by the commission to paint portraits of the Prince of Wales and other members of

ROBERTSON'S STYLE

the royal family. Success waited upon his genius and energy, and his stay in London became essential to his own and his family's prospects. His attachment to the royal princesses was to a great extent reciprocated, for he speaks of the enthusiastic way they sat to him, and helped him to make perfect pictures. Robertson seems to have been most partial to the charms of Princess Amelia, whom he describes as a 'lovely creature, fine features, melting eyes, charming figure, elegant, dignified, finest hair imaginable.' Then he deplores the fact of her sitting in a hat and cap which hid this last-named distinguishing feature. The portrait he refers to is now in the royal collection, and is remarkable for its vigorous drawing and colouring, characteristics which distinguish most of his best work. The dress and hat in this example are a very strong blue, and the flesh is very full in colouring; but the whole picture is treated with such balance and boldness that the result is very pleasing (Plate xxx.).

In 1815 Robertson paid a long visit to Paris, where the works of art brought together by Napoleon were in course of dispersal.

Robertson's style of painting was such that even his contemporaries often mistook his miniatures for oil. On one occasion, when showing some of his work to Ozias Humphry, the latter could hardly believe that they were water-colour until he had looked at them through a powerful glass. This is not to be wondered at, when we consider how much they represent the opposite of the style of his contemporaries. It is evident that Robertson won the admiration of all his fellow-artists who were broad-minded enough to own his superiority. Even Cosway graciously praised the young man's work, and seems to have been struck by its qualities. Robertson was congratulating himself on one occasion that the brilliant enamels by Bone were not hung near the ivory miniatures, upon which Cosway remarked, 'Mr. Bone's pictures are very fine and brilliant, but they are not nature, they are but china, let him do what he will, and

MINIATURES

as hard—they have not the softness of flesh—were this head to appear among them,’—pointing to one of Robertson’s,—‘the soft fleshiness of it would kill his.’

The miniature of Charles Heath, the eminent engraver, which is here reproduced for the first time (Plate xxix.), is as beautiful an example of Robertson’s smaller paintings as I have seen. The colour print loses some of the mellowness and force of the original, but otherwise has the distinction and masterly quality so characteristic of his best work. Robertson was essentially a painter of men’s portraits, his colour scheme being somewhat too solid and strong for the prevailing taste in miniatures of women. His art shows us a most admirable interpretation ‘in little’ of the best qualities to be found in the contemporary oil portraitists, and at the same time a robust grasp of character which refused to pander to any artificial tastes of the time. He usually painted on a considerably larger scale than other miniaturists of the time, and often on square-shaped ivories. His backgrounds are strong and heavy in tone, and sometimes hot in colour, and a peculiarity which may be seen in the miniature of Charles Heath, is the daring way the flesh-colour or an approximate tint is introduced into the background. This seems to be in defiance of all recognised canons of portraiture, but I think its success is mainly due to the strength of colour and shadow on the face and the breadth of quality in the tone and painting, enabling the head to dominate this treatment of the background. The general warmth of tone had the advantage of simplifying the effect of the miniature, and preventing the head from telling out as a spot of hot colour. This is one of those characteristics that it is fatal to imitate; it owes its charm to the inspiration of an artist who possesses a corresponding intuition of how best to attain the proper balance in giving expression to it. In attempting to copy it, we cannot retain the balance for lack of the inspiration, and we convict ourselves of plagiarism and nothing else.

ANDREW ROBERTSON'S BROTHERS

Amongst other gifts, Robertson was distinguished as an amateur violin-player, and very actively interested himself in the volunteer movement, which was then in its initial state of formation. He had many pupils, some of whom afterwards became eminent miniaturists. On his retirement in 1841, with a great reputation, after thirty years' practice, his brothers of the sable brush presented him with a piece of plate in recognition of their admiration for his genius. He died at Hampstead on December 6, 1845.

Andrew Robertson had two brothers, Archibald and Alexander. Archibald, the elder, was born in 1765, and received his first instruction in drawing from a deaf and dumb artist, probably Charles Sheriff the miniaturist. In 1786 he became a student of the Royal Academy, working under Sir Joshua Reynolds and Benjamin West, and his miniature portraits soon attracted attention. By the suggestion of some Scottish friends, he then went to America with a letter of introduction to Washington from the Earl of Buchan, who also sent by him a present, known as the Wallace Box, requesting at the same time a portrait of Washington from the pencil of Robertson. This portrait was painted in oils; but Archibald also painted miniatures on ivory of Washington and his wife. His success was so complete that he settled in America, and his younger brother Alexander, who had studied the art under Samuel Shelley in London, joined him in the year 1792. Together they started a school, known as the Columbian Academy, at 79 Liberty Street, New York.

Archibald died in 1835, leaving a large family, and Alexander in 1841, leaving no descendants.

Andrew Robertson's pupil, Sir William Charles Ross, was perhaps the last great miniature painter of the nineteenth century. From his time forward the decline of the art was as rapid as the previous rise had been, and due to causes which I shall consider later. Sir William's father, William Ross, was a Scottish miniature painter, who gained

MINIATURES

a certain amount of celebrity by his miniatures, which he exhibited at the Royal Academy in the early nineteenth century. Maria Ross, his wife, was also an artist, so it is not surprising that their son showed early in life his natural bent, which was probably hastened by his inability from physical delicacy to enter into boyish games. William was born in 1794, and we are told that he executed miniatures of the Duke of Portland, Lord Bentinck, and others, with much truth and delicacy of colouring before he was ten years old. At the phenomenal age of thirteen he entered the Royal Academy schools, and there his progress was marked by many successes. Between the years 1807 and 1817 the young artist was also successful in winning seven premiums from the Society of Arts, which included their small and large silver palettes, and a gold medal for an original painting. His earliest works were historical subjects of an ambitious character, and his name first appears in the Academy catalogue of 1809 as 'Master W. C. Ross,' when he exhibited three works, two of which were important historical pieces, and the third a portrait group in miniature representing a Venus and Cupid. It was at the age of twenty that Ross first paid serious attention to miniature painting, and a little later became the assistant and pupil of Andrew Robertson. From this time he devoted himself almost exclusively to the art. His great success and the extent of his patronage may be judged from the fact that the total number of his miniatures considerably exceeds two thousand. In 1839 he was elected an A.R.A., and in the year 1842 an R.A., also being knighted the same year. His famous portraits include likenesses of Queen Victoria, the Prince Consort, the King and Queen of the Belgians, the King and Queen of France, and many members of the royal families of these three countries, besides which he painted the chief beauties and highest dignitaries of our aristocracy. His energy and enthusiasm for his art continued unabated until 1857, when a stroke of paralysis forced him to give

SIR W. ROSS AND A. CHALON

up work, and after three years of ill-health and suffering he died in 1860.

The period at which Sir William Ross painted was unfortunate in its fashions of dress, and it is difficult to make due allowance for a fact like this when studying his miniatures. Nothing tends to handicap a portrait painter more than a hideous and senseless mode of attire. The artist's knowledge of what constitutes a charming *ensemble* is based upon certain leading principles outside the dictates of fashion, which principles have for their object the adornment, not the extinguishment, of the natural form. He knows that slovenliness is not synonymous with picturesqueness; on the other hand, primness debars all natural grace.

Ross's work contains most excellent and strong qualities of drawing, colour, and composition—in fact all the necessary qualifications for the production of pleasing and picturesque miniatures; but the dress of his sitters was stiff, practical, and uninspiring, with the result that their portraits, however good, do not charm or fascinate us. The principal defect to be noticed in the work of Ross is the equal definition of light and focus displayed over the entire miniature. The tones of the flesh are equally high, whether in the painting of the hands and arms or face. His painting is a little hard and academic, and lacks the power to suggest more than it gives us, whilst it often gives us too much.

There are at Windsor no less than forty-four examples by Sir W. Ross, and they include some of his best work, amongst them being the well-known portrait of the Prince Consort. The very graceful portrait of Mrs. Dalton, which is illustrated (Plate xxxi.), gives an admirable idea of Sir W. Ross's power of drawing and painting. Hugh Ross, the younger brother of Sir William, also painted miniatures and exhibited at the Royal Academy from 1814 to 1845, and their sister Magdalene practised the same branch of art.

One of Sir W. Ross's greatest friends was Alfred

MINIATURES

Edward Chalon, the miniaturist. He was a native of Geneva, where he was born in 1780. He early showed his disinclination to take up a commercial life, and at the age of seventeen entered the Royal Academy schools. In 1808. he became a member of the Society of Associated Artists in Water-Colour, and with the assistance of his brother, John James Chalon, and six others, he founded the 'Evening Sketching Society,' which continued to meet until about 1850. It was in the first year of the century that he exhibited his first picture, a miniature, at the Royal Academy, and in 1812 he was elected an Associate, and a full member four years later. At that time, and for many years after, he was the most fashionable portrait-painter in water-colours.

Earlier in his career Chalon painted miniatures on ivory, but it was as a painter of small full-lengths, usually about fifteen inches high, that he enjoyed such extensive patronage. He was the first to paint Queen Victoria on her accession to the throne, and received the appointment of painter in water-colours to the Queen.

Leslie, a warm admirer, speaking of an exhibition of Chalon's works, says: 'It was to me a proof, if I had wanted one, of the non-appreciation of colour at the present time, that the exhibition of J. and A. Chalon's pictures failed to attract notice.' This was said in reference to the works of both brothers, which included many pictures in oil. Alfred Chalon alone painted upwards of three hundred in this medium, which he exhibited at the Royal Academy and elsewhere. He was a great admirer of Watteau's pictures, and he based his style on the works of the French artist. Alfred Chalon's manner of drawing displayed a certain lightness and grace in spite of its monotony, flimsiness, and a prevalent carelessness. Chalon was an accomplished musician and a keen wit and a most genial host, and he lived to a great age, dying at Campden Hill, Kensington, in 1860. He had lived the whole of his life with his brother John, both having remained bachelors.



Portrait of a Lady
BY SIR W. J. NEWTON

M^{rs} Dalton
BY SIR WILLIAM ROSS

T. T. Vardham Esq.
BY HENRY EDRIE

Portrait of a Lady
BY JOHN BOSCH

SIR WILLIAM J. NEWTON—JAMES HOLMES

Sir William J. Newton was a painter of miniatures. He was the son of James Newton the engraver, and was born in London in 1785. Commencing his career as an engraver, he very soon turned to miniature painting, and became a serious rival to Sir William Ross, though his work as a rule lacks that painter's power of drawing and character. He was appointed miniature painter in ordinary to William IV. and Queen Adelaide, and from 1837 to 1858 held the same office under Queen Victoria. He was knighted in 1837, and died in London in 1869. Newton invented a method of joining several pieces of ivory together, which enabled him to paint some historical groups of a large size. The portrait of a lady on Plate xxxi. is a very pretty miniature by this painter, from the South Kensington Museum.

Thomas Carrick, a native of Cumberland, came to London about 1841, and painted miniatures with considerable success, exhibiting almost regularly numerous examples of his work at the Royal Academy between 1841 and 1860. During the principal part of his stay here he resided at 10 Montague Street, Portman Square, where many notable people sat to him for their portraits.

James Holmes was born in 1777, the same year as Andrew Robertson, and like the latter possessed many accomplishments. His genial character and musical talents gained him the friendship of George IV. He was at first apprenticed to an engraver, but on the termination of his apprenticeship he took up the art of water-colour painting. In 1813 he became a member of the Society of Painters in Water-Colours, and sent two pictures to their exhibition. Six years later he commenced exhibiting miniatures at the Royal Academy. He was one of the principal promoters of the Society of British Artists, who held their first exhibition in 1824, and he continued exhibiting miniatures at these galleries until 1850, when he resigned. He painted miniatures of Lord Byron, and the latter observes in a letter dated Genoa, May 19, 1823: 'A painter of the name of Holmes

MINIATURES

made, I think, the very best one of me in 1815 or 1816, and from this there were some good engravings taken.' This miniature now belongs to Mr. Isaac Falcke. Holmes returned to Shropshire in his later years, and died in 1860.

Another contemporary miniature painter, William Egley, was a native of Doncaster, and born in 1798. His father became confidential agent to the Walkers of Eastwood soon after William's birth, and destined his two sons for the trade of booksellers. They were received into the house of Darton the publisher, Holborn Hill, London, but William managed to teach himself the art of miniature, and to stimulate his love of painting by occasional visits to the Royal Academy exhibitions at Somerset House. Without any other training he successfully finished two miniature portraits of Colonel Ogleby, and Yates the actor, which were received at the Royal Academy in 1824. This started him on his professional career, and from this time until his death he exhibited one hundred and sixty-nine miniatures at the Royal Academy, and painted nearly two thousand pictures, which included portraits of nearly every family of distinction in England, besides many notable foreigners. His success was chiefly exemplified in the portrayal of children, with whom he was a great favourite. He died in London in 1870, aged seventy-two, and left a son, William Maw Egley, who was known as a historical painter.

The character of Joseph Severn, the painter and miniaturist, was much influenced by the literary culture of his associates, and by Keats in particular, and his life was really mainly distinguished for its artistic aspirations rather than its achievements. He was born at Hoxton in 1793. His father, James Severn, was a musician by profession, and the son early showed great facility in drawing, and in lieu of other tuition was placed with an engraver. The constraint of constant and mechanical copying without colour he found intolerable, and so he

JOSEPH SEVERN AND KEATS

contrived to find time for the execution of original drawings, and small portraits in water-colours at the rate of half-a-guinea a piece, while he managed to pick up some instruction as a casual student at the Academy schools. About the year 1816 he formed a friendship with Keats, and his devotion to the poet until his death shows many passages of self-denial on the part of the young artist. In 1817 the Royal Academy offered a gold medal for the best painting of a historical subject. For twelve years the prize had been withheld on account of the lack of merit amongst the candidates. The subject, taken from Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, fired young Severn's imagination, which had already been stimulated by his poet friend, and he determined to compete, although not having previously painted in oil. He worked with untiring energy, selling all his valuables to procure necessities, and to his own and the general surprise was declared the winner. This success did not, however, lead to further encouragement in this style of painting, and he devoted much time to miniature work, in which he found greater patronage, although at that time only receiving small prices.

There is an interesting letter from Keats to Joseph Severn, evidently in answer to a request for permission to exhibit a miniature of the poet at the Royal Academy, showing the latter's opinion of the exhibition, for he says: ' . . . Of course I should never suffer any petty vanity of mine to hinder you in any wise, and therefore I should say, put the miniature in the exhibition if only myself were to be hurt. But will it not hurt you? What good can it do any future picture? Even a large picture is lost in that canting place. What a drop of water in the ocean is a miniature! '

Among the circle of friends which Keats drew around himself, Severn had the advantage of the intimacy of Leigh Hunt, Haydon, Haslam, and John Hamilton Reynolds, and it was also at Keats's house that Severn met Wordsworth. It was in September 1820 that he

MINIATURES

generously resolved to sacrifice his own professional advantage and, with but £25 that he had just received for a miniature, to accompany the invalid Keats to Italy. Severn went against much opposition from his father, who is even said to have knocked him down, and in spite of imperilling his prospect of gaining at Rome a travelling pension from the Royal Academy, he devoted himself to his friend until his death on February 24, 1821. After this, he applied himself to the completion of the picture which was to win him a travelling scholarship of £130 for three years. His friendship for Keats, to use his own words, 'had become a kind of passport to the English in Rome, and I soon found myself in the midst of not only the most polished society, but the most Christian in the world.' The fascination of this society and the country itself seems to have satisfied the artist's cultured instincts, and the patronage he received was sufficient for his needs. He painted some historical and imaginative pictures, which he sent to the Royal Academy in London, besides which he painted portraits and subjects of modern Roman life; but he will always be best remembered by his connection with Keats, whom he painted and drew many times, the most famous of his miniatures of the poet being the half-length one now in the possession of Sir Charles Dilke, which is illustrated here by his kind permission (Plate xxxii.).

Severn married in 1828 Elizabeth, daughter of Archibald, Lord Montgomerie, a ward of the Countess of Westmorland, and later, in 1841, he returned to England for the purpose of educating his children. He enjoyed the friendship of Eastlake, George Richmond, and Mr. Ruskin, but not finding much encouragement in his art he devoted more and more of his time to literature. Mr. Locker-Lampson describes him in 1859 as a 'jaunty, fresh-natured, irresponsible sort of elderly being, leading a facile, slipshod, dressing-gowny, artistic existence in Pimlico.' A little later, mainly through the influence of Mr. Gladstone, Severn was made British Consul at



John Keats
by J. Martin, 1819

ROBERT THORBURN AND H. C. HEATH

Rome on the retirement of Charles Newton, who afterwards became his son-in-law. This office he retained with credit until 1872, when he retired on a pension. He continued to live in Rome, painting almost until his death in 1879. Severn never lost an opportunity of showing his devotion to the memory of his early friend, a memory which haunted and completely coloured his whole life, and it is this friendship which forms his greatest claim to the remembrance of posterity.

And now we have arrived at the last exponent who can claim to be considered as belonging to the renaissance of miniature art, and as a really good painter of portraits 'in little.' Robert Thorburn was a Scotsman, and born at Dumfries in 1818. He was the son of a tradesman, and received his education at the High School of his native town, but soon showing a decided taste for the arts, through the kindness of a lady in the neighbourhood, he was sent at the age of fifteen to Edinburgh to study at the Academy, where he gained distinction. About three years later he came to London, and entered the schools of the Royal Academy. As a native of Dumfries the Duke of Buccleuch took an especial interest in him, and obtained him many commissions, the first being from Queen Victoria, and this was followed by many others. For a long period he shared with Sir William Ross the patronage of fashionable society.

Thorburn's miniatures were often of a larger size than was usual, showing more of the figure and having landscape backgrounds, so that sometimes he was obliged to join several pieces of ivory together to obtain the requisite proportions. They are academically well drawn and painted, and are excellent likenesses, very highly finished, but they are hard and somewhat unfeeling, and suffer from a lack of picturesqueness of costume. Thorburn was elected an A.R.A. in 1848, and he also won a gold medal at the International Exhibition of Paris. On the advent of photography Thorburn found that the new craze superseded miniature painting, so he took to oil

MINIATURES

painting and exhibited at the Royal Academy some portraits and other subjects in this medium, but they lacked the oil painter's quality and force. He had as a pupil Henry Charles Heath, who, although practising the art before photography seriously affected it, must be considered as the first of the revivalists, and he successfully won for himself a high position as a miniaturist in the latter half of the nineteenth century.

Henry Charles Heath was the son of Charles Heath the engraver, whose father was also a well-known engraver, James Heath, A.R.A. The grandson was born in 1829, and was originally educated as an engineer at King's College, London, where he gained many prizes and distinctions. His natural inclinations, however, were towards the arts, and on the death of his father in 1848 he took up miniature painting as a profession. He was helped in the first steps by Henry Corbould, and then became a student of the Royal Academy, after which he worked as an assistant to Robert Thorburn, thus completing his training, and he soon obtained a connection of his own. Then photography despoiled him of his clients, but, using his talents to master the new craft, he for many years excelled as one of the first photographers of children, taken by an instantaneous process of his own invention. In spite of great success in this business, the constant strain which it entailed, and his artistic ambitions, prompted him to throw over his position in 1872 and again take to his original art of miniature painting. Through the introduction of Edward Corbould, who was drawing-master to the young princesses, Heath obtained several commissions from Queen Victoria, and from that time, notwithstanding the prevailing fashion for the 'fugitive silver print,' he slowly gained a sure footing as one of the very few eminent painters of miniature portraits then living. During his career Heath painted many miniatures of the Queen and several of the Prince Consort and the princesses.

At the height of his success, about the year 1890, he

CHARLES TURRELL

was appointed miniature-painter to Queen Victoria, and he continued to paint and exhibit until the time of his death in 1898. The last royal portrait he executed was a minute likeness of the late Duke of Clarence. This miniature was only three-eighths of an inch in diameter, and it formed the centre of an antique brooch richly set with diamonds. It was commissioned by Queen Victoria for the Princess of Wales. Heath exhibited a great number of miniatures at the Royal Academy, and also some portraits and other subjects in oil. He was one of the original members of the Society of Miniature Painters formed in 1894. His work is notable for the purity of the flesh-colour, a refinement of feeling, and an absence of the finicking littleness of detail which was then taking the place of broader and finer qualities. This is admirably shown in the portrait of a child, illustrated here (Plate xxxiii.).

Towards the latter end of the nineteenth century something like a revival set in of miniature portraits. The majority of these, as represented at the exhibitions of the Royal Academy and elsewhere, were characterless and without distinction. It was obvious to the most casual critic that the photograph inspired their production. Their merits fitted the commercial requirements of a public, whose taste had been vitiated by the insipid print, and whose one idea of a portrait miniature was a finicking, expressionless monotony of minute stippling, which conscientiously left out every and any mark of character or individuality. It is refreshing amongst this mass of mediocrity to refer to the work of Charles Turrell, who is still exercising his art. Perhaps the younger generation of miniaturists in the last century owed more to Turrell's work than to any other more remote influence.

Charles Turrell was born January 14, 1846, and as a child showed great fondness for drawing. At the age of nineteen he became the pupil of a Mr. Sargeant, a miniature painter, under whom he studied for three years. In 1867 he visited the United States, and engaged himself

MINIATURES

to paint miniatures for Sarony of New York for two years, exhibiting at the 'Academy of Design.'

Before the two years had expired he married and returned to England, and shortly afterwards commenced exhibiting at the Royal Academy, and has continued to do so ever since, having exhibited a far greater number of portraits than any other living artist. For many years after 1881 Turrell's studio was in Bond Street, and during this period, and up to the present time, the number of his distinguished sitters has been eloquent testimony to the eminence he has attained amongst contemporary miniaturists. Queen Victoria, Queen Alexandra (when Princess of Wales) and all her daughters, have sat to this painter 'in little,' as well as members of the nobility and aristocracy too numerous to mention. Gladstone was a frequent visitor to the studio in Bond Street, and took a great interest in the art of miniature. Charles Turrell has exploited American society with no less success and distinction, and he has generally spent his winters in America, on account of the light being better than in London. Amongst his distinguished American clients are the Vanderbilts and Mr. Pierpont Morgan, who possesses a very beautiful collection of old miniatures, now at Prince's Gate.

An interesting circumstance in connection with a group painted by Turrell, of Sir Richard Musgrove's two daughters, is the introduction into the picture of the famous 'Luck of Edenhall,' which inspired the ballad by the German poet Uhland, translated by Longfellow. The exhibition of 'Fair Women' at the Grafton Galleries contained all the miniatures which Turrell had painted for H.M. Queen Alexandra.

The work of Charles Turrell may possibly claim a certain relationship to the art of Richard Cosway. This is especially noticeable in his simple and uniform scheme of colour and balance of darks in the picture. We do not find the freedom or finesse displayed by the earlier master, but on the other hand there is evident a more



Portrait of a Child.

BY H. C. HEATH.



The Duchess of Portland

BY C. TURRELL.

EDWARD TAYLOR

obligatory intention of obtaining a portrait. The modern painter has a defined and well-chosen distinction of expression, which gives grace and dignity to all his miniatures.

Before closing my remarks on the nineteenth century, I ought not to omit to name H. T. Wells, R.A., and Edward Taylor and E. Moira, all of whom have painted members of the royal family, and are represented in the royal collection at Windsor. Edward Taylor is still an active member of the Society of Miniature Painters.

CHAPTER X

MODERN MINIATURE PAINTING—THE TWENTIETH CENTURY AND ITS OPPORTUNITIES

ALTHOUGH in writing on the art of the miniaturist I have of necessity treated the subject more especially from the artist's point of view, and criticised it technically, I have endeavoured not to lose sight of the fact that there are many shades of cultured opinion which take another and less professional standpoint. There is the very select minority of experts who can place their fingers with unerring and scientific certainty on the merits or demerits of a work, can classify it with infallibility, and place it in just that particular niche or corner of the historic cabinet to which its date, school, or characteristics entitle it. Their opinions should be quite impartial. There is the equally select, if rather larger, minority of connoisseurs, whose cultured judgments within their narrower and more especial field are interesting, even when tinctured with a personal bias or prejudice in favour of a school or master.

And, again, there is the collector whose enthusiasm is a reflection of an acquired taste, and whose knowledge is the result of circumstances and opportunities too indefinable to classify.

Finally, there is the intuitive instinct of those who have studied art with an irresponsible motive, and to satisfy only their individual sensitiveness for the beautiful. All these aspects are different and distinct from the professional one, and yet all have a very decided value in helping forward the much-needed advancement of art education amongst the uninitiated majority.

BANEFUL INFLUENCE OF PHOTOGRAPHY

The professional aspect differs principally from all these, in that it views art from behind the scenes, and is therefore more competent to analyse intentions and criticise methods, but judges results through the medium of methods rather than through the senses alone. This analytical point of view should, I think, add usefulness to the present treatise for all sections of my readers who take the subject seriously.

In the preceding pages I have reviewed the wealth of inheritance which is ours. We are the heirs to the accumulated experience, knowledge, and genius that have slowly and surely added branch to branch, leaf to leaf, and blossom to blossom, and to-day give us the fruits of centuries of effort and inspiration.

The artist cannot ignore previous manners of expression: from them he will choose and build up his own language and evolve in practice a manner peculiar to himself. By manners of expression I mean something more than the mere handling of the medium. I would include the measure of idealism, of selection, of convention, helping to form the style or school. I would weigh the proportion of its manual and mental attributes, and above all the source of its inspiration. For it is in its source of inspiration that we shall discover the real pulse of a school's vitality.

The great painters gloried in their birthright; they educated their judgment and insight by a study of the best works of the best schools posterity had bequeathed to them. It should be a part of our pride to awake to the magnitude of our responsibilities, to guard ourselves against a lethargy of contentment, to put away mere dexterous expression of trivialities, and strive for those greater essentials of a nobler art.

It would be an equivocal task to sit in judgment on the work of modern miniature painters. We may with advantage, however, put our house in order, examine our motives, analyse our inspirations and intentions, and compare them with those of greater

MINIATURES

periods, epochs richer in the productions of truly inspired masterpieces.

We must acknowledge that the modern painter of small portraits labours under many disadvantages, and has many difficulties to contend with. His position demands a robustness of professional constitution never so necessary as now. He has to face a long-continued degeneracy of the art and a perverted public taste, mainly due to photography. This enemy to the delightful cult has insidiously and in the guise of sincerity slowly warped and misled public appreciation. It has assumed the airs of a fine art when, as a matter of fact, its plumes are borrowed, and it is quite incapable of giving us, in portraiture, any artistic truth other than a weak reflection of some quality rendered far better by the genius of the artist. This is not the worst; under this guise of sincerity it gives us an insipid, unselective imitation that falsifies nature, and has been fruitful in educating a demand for a soft, boneless, characterless prettiness in portraiture, the very antithesis to real style, form, and individuality. Much more might be said to insist on the baneful influence of this clever craft on public taste, and on the work of the miniaturist, but it is sufficient to mention facts of a historic interest in their relation to miniature painting.

Sir Joshua Reynolds has said, 'The great end of art is to strike the imagination. . . . An inferior artist is unwilling that any part of his industry should be lost upon the spectator. He takes as much pains to discover, as the great artist does to conceal, the marks of his subordinate assiduity. In the works of the lower kind everything appears studied and encumbered; it is all boastful art and open affectation. The ignorant often part from such pictures with wonder in their mouths and indifference in their hearts.' This passage seems to me peculiarly applicable to much of our modern miniature work. In the miniature portrait particularly it is so easy to assume that the end is attained when we have carefully studied

THE EVILS OF STIPPLING

all the parts, and conscientiously portrayed in every detail the subject before us. This is a realism of a trivial and insipid type. Public taste rightly demands that a miniature should be highly finished. A portrait of such small dimensions is handled at close range and studied with leisured care. It is, moreover, set elegantly, and often in close proximity to precious jewels, and therefore should possess a certain conformity of preciousness. The miniaturist, whilst attaining this, should remember that the degree of elaboration must be carried no further than that which is useful to truth and beauty and not injurious to breadth and dignity.

All real admirers and enthusiasts of this beautiful art must wish to see it placed on a truer and more dignified footing. With the splendid traditions it has behind it, with the imperishable genius by which its earlier exponents have illumined its past history, there is every cause to justify the most optimistic belief in its final resurrection. There is no lack of present-day interest in the art; it only lacks discretion and culture on the part of the public, and robustness and individuality on the part of the artist. There was, perhaps, never so much technical excellence in the mere manipulation and so little imagination or inspiration in the treatment. How often do we see a suggestion of that dignified decorative impulse, which is one of the miniature's oldest inheritances? It is rarely that we see even the most elementary attempt at placing the subject within the frame with an interesting regard for grace, distinction, or character; yet there is much to be gained by a true instinct for proportion, a feeling regard for line and an appropriateness of pose.

It is noticeable that the art of miniature in the present day is almost entirely excluded from the domain of male portraiture. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries there were, if anything, more men than women painted, and these small portraits of men lacked none of the masculine sternness and severity so indispensable to them. With the introduction of ivory we find the

MINIATURES

miniature gradually changed its character and became more essentially a graceful and delicate interpretation, best suited to the charms of femininity. There have been painters such as Robertson who have given us a masterly masculine treatment of a man's portrait on ivory, but his work depended for its force on drawing, and vigour of light and shade, rather than its flesh qualities. My conclusion is that the peculiar virtue of ivory as a base has helped towards the effeminacy of treatment and has checked the more vigorous impulses, whilst it undoubtedly enables the painter to obtain a prettiness and transparent brilliancy of colour suitable to the feminine complexion. With ivory the stipple has become more obvious and unavoidable, with the result of emphasising the labour and destroying technical freedom. That this is not a necessary evil has been eloquently proved by Cosway and Robertson. The miniature of Mrs. Butler, illustrated in these pages (Plate xxiv.), is an example; its colour is floated on with great dexterity. Andrew Robertson, again, most frequently floated his colours on to the ivory, using the stipple only to unite and blend the tints or flatten and broaden the tones. I have seen in recent years a few examples in which this method has been adopted with some success. It naturally requires a considerable amount of skill and deftness of handling, and a clearer and more defined intention, whilst the prevailing manner is purely tentative and laborious. The *gouache* or solid method of the French school, in painting the backgrounds and costumes, obviates the necessity of stipple, and in the work of Adolphe Hall this process was carried to perfection, the flesh-tints being left transparent, the contrast thus obtained adding much to the general effect. Hall used the *gouache* with consummate skill, exercising a freedom of touch that suggests a small oil painting, at the same time losing none of the delicacy of his medium. English miniaturists rarely, if ever, have attempted to use solid colour in this way, and no doubt they are right in thinking that a loss of force and contrast

SOCIETY OF MINIATURE PAINTERS

is more than counterbalanced by an airy lightness and tender harmony of tone, such as our best masters have achieved. We must at least be sure that we attain this compensating quality. There are no living miniaturists who, in attempting to give us something of Cosway's manner, either attain the tenderness of his tone and colour or the freedom of his handling. Without these qualities, what is left of the Cosway miniature? To place the whole matter on its true footing, Cosway's treatment was only suited to the contemporary modes of an artificial society. The powdered hair, the delicate complexion, the cold blue and silvery greyness of the backgrounds, the semi-classical diaphanous draperies, were all parts of a general scheme which harmonised with Cosway's beautiful though artificial convention. To-day patrons demand something more actual. They would unhesitatingly refuse a 'Cosway' as a portrait unless it were professedly of a real or imaginary ancestor. They ask for a true, lifelike portrait, painted in a Cosway manner—itself an impossible combination. Once paint the flesh colour up to nature, and the whole theme must of necessity be altered to be in harmony, and thus the tender balance is lost and we have the modern affectation of Cosway.

Yet in spite of this, Cosway is the presiding genius of the art in the estimation of the public. He represents at once the beginning and the end of the art, whereas in reality there is very little of Cosway left in the phantom which stimulates the craze. Few of these enthusiasts to-day know what an original by that master is like. If they have seen one, they have been carried away by its prettiness, which has blinded their more critical faculties. To appreciate the work of any master, we must approach it in a critical and analytical spirit, born of true knowledge, and we must see not one only but many examples from the same hand.

The modern miniaturist has a very serious task before him if he would wean public favour from the commercial and mechanical miniature portrait, and place his art com-

MINIATURES

pletely outside competition with it. That this seriousness is felt by a few of the leading painters is proved by the formation of the Society of Miniature Painters, and a kindred society in 1894. Unfortunately, these societies were constituted with too large a roll of membership. This could only weaken their sphere of usefulness by lowering their prestige. Prestige, I submit, is the first essential of a society. This can only be achieved by making the standard of work necessary to election as high as possible, even if no more than twenty artists could be found to qualify for it. Twenty members who bound themselves by their enthusiasm for their art to descend to no triviality or pettiness, in pandering to a stereotyped convention, for the mere sake of gain, would ultimately become a source of influence, tenfold greater than a society of a hundred members, the majority of whom take a much lower standpoint and whose ambitions do not rise above a possible income. To do this, the twenty members must possess sufficient robustness to constitute themselves a miniature corporation for the study and advancement of their art. They should fearlessly face their responsibilities and justify their superior aims by the steadfastness of their study and the unprejudiced appreciation and help they tender to rising talent. A society to have a vital influence must do something more than hold exhibitions; its sphere of activity should be more in the nature of a guild. It should hold meetings, invite lectures, acquire representative specimens of the best schools, possess a library, and form a class at which members and probationary members could paint from the life, and so train and prove their ability. Every opportunity should be given to study the history and traditions of the art. Copies of the old masters in miniature should be encouraged, and members and probationary members invited to present such copies to form a permanent gallery belonging to the society. On election to membership a painter should be obliged to present a specimen of his best work to the society, and the con-

TECHNICAL TRADITIONS

firmation of full membership should not be complete until the acceptance of this diploma work by the council. In suggesting the lines on which a successful society might achieve its object, that of adding prestige to the art, I claim no originality for my ideas. It is only reverting to a modified form of an old institution—the Mediæval Art Guild.

With our modern ideas of professional dignity it is curious to know that the painter of the Mediæval period did not consider himself, and was not considered by the public, as superior to a man of another trade. It was not until after the artist became independent of the restraint of the guilds, and his art commenced to degenerate, that he gave himself airs of superiority. To-day it would be considered entirely *infra dig.* for an artist to submit to the supervision of his materials and methods, or to have his conscientiousness and honesty of purpose liable to be called in question. Yet there are many reasons why there should be some sort of restriction as to the quality of the materials used in miniature painting. A client commissions a painter to paint a portrait on ivory, and pays a fair price. In return he should receive as a matter of equity a good portrait, painted in permanent colours, on ivory that has not been bleached with peroxide of hydrogen, as is sometimes the case, to the utter destruction of the colours. I submit that all this should be enforced as a point of common justice, even if we do not go so far as to assert that a painter should possess some kind of diploma of artistic merit and technical ability. It may be argued that to subject the artist to such businesslike tests is to humiliate him and destroy the prestige of his art. I confidently assert that the reverse would be the case; it would only tend to rid the profession of the incompetent, and would increase the seriousness with which aspirants studied and qualified themselves. The painter whose training was above reproach, or whose genius was beyond doubt, would have nothing to fear. Where the Mediæval schools acted

MINIATURES

detrimentally, if at all, was in their tendency to value conscientiousness at too high an estimation, but we must remember that in those unaffected days there existed no impulses towards impressionism in art. The artist's creed was a very simple one: his excellence depended on an honest proficiency in drawing and painting, and a knowledge of arrangement and composition which was none the worse for being traditional and within certain prescribed rules.

It would be impossible to make the modern Flemish school of painting conform to any technical guild. Technically every painter is a law unto himself—in fact it would almost seem that extravagance of technique is the first thing that is sought after, with an entirely impressionistic aspect of nature. There is no relationship between the modern Flemish painter and his honest, austere ancestor. The same might be said of many other modern schools of oil painting; they ignore their noblest traditions, they blind their eyes to all qualities that are not effervescently brilliant. There appears to exist an extravagant revolt against labour or the appearance of labour in the methods of to-day. As the old painters worked with the conscientiousness of a simple interpretation of nature, so the modern painter has learned to strive after the transitory aspects of her, and his technique has become as restless and as fickle as his inspirations.

The miniature portrait has very defined limitations, and there is obviously not the same scope for what may be termed experimental effects of technique. It is therefore much easier to believe that the art would gain by a uniformity of method, akin to that which was practised by the technical guilds—at any rate, that it is in the Flemish school that a solid foundation is to be found from which a new and vigorous style may grow.

I have it on the authority of Mr. Alyn Williams, the enthusiastic vice-president of the Society of Miniature Painters, that several of the more distinguished members of the Society are working towards an en-

EXISTING SOCIETIES

deavour to bring it more into line with their ideals. The membership is slowly being reduced in numbers—the idea of probationary members or associateship is being considered. The work of members is to be subjected to the approval of the council, and to be rejected if not considered to be on a high enough level. There is little doubt that the Society requires all this to make it an institution which may gradually restore the prestige of the art. It depends on the robustness and determination of the few leaders, whether the art is to be content to continue wearily trudging in the footsteps of a threadbare convention, or boldly declare itself capable of giving us a new inspiration.

It is idle to deny that the majority of paintings on ivory to-day cannot be placed for a moment on the same level with the productions of other branches of the art of portraiture. They are produced with a minimum amount of effort and study, by the aid or under the influence of the pernicious photograph. This saps the vigour and freedom of the artist, and reduces the art to the ignominious position of depending on the craft that robbed it of its inheritance. A love for the art makes me appreciative of anything that indicates vitality or renewed life in the work of contemporaries. I should rejoice at eccentricity as a sign of vigour, at absolute plagiarism and imitation as a sign of study, and it is even a delight to come across work where nature has been carefully and thoughtfully expressed, even if in a trivial manner; but such sparks of fire are rare, and the vast army of stipplers in the present day sit perseveringly at their easels and see little beyond the tips of their sables. Why is it deemed unnecessary for the aspirant to miniature painting to do more than have a dozen or so lessons, and then launch himself in competition with the painter who has given the best years of his life to training, unless it is the photograph that helps the cripple home? To be capable of deftly painting from the life a head from a quarter of

MINIATURES

an inch to an inch in size, giving the vitality, expression, and portraiture of the subject, requires a skill and knowledge that are worthy of the most liberal recognition. It is the mediocre amateur posing as a professional who is lowering the prestige of the art. Let the skilled miniature portraitist produce small portraits equal to a Cooper, and there would be no fear of competition from the photograph or the amateur.

We cannot overlook the fact that there are more miniaturists now than ever there were. Numbers alone will not make a renaissance, though it may emphasise the existence of an opportunity for a leader to lift the art out of obscurity. It needs a painter whose courage is equal to the opportunity, and who will seize the occasion with the necessary self-sacrifice. It may mean losing paying commissions, it may mean acting in the teeth of a respectable majority, but if successful in its object it will again place the art on a serious footing, in competition with other arts. If we look at the roll of membership of existing societies, we find that more than eighty per cent. are women. I have no prejudice against the woman miniaturist, as such. The art is essentially suited to the delicate touch of the weaker sex, and certainly amongst the few painters whose work is remarkable to-day, women quite hold their own; but we know unfortunately that most of the women painters are not seriously inclined. From the commencement they underrate the dignity of the art, and overrate the importance of their small endeavours. They have a few lessons in the use and management of the brush and colours, but they seldom realise the great importance of drawing as the first and last real essential to all portraiture. Freedom and facility of expression, directness and breadth of drawing, are not acquired in a dozen lessons. Nothing but a hardy and continued enthusiasm can attain the finest qualities of drawing. It is something more than accuracy that is wanted: it is a large, sweeping appreciation of form, which never loses sight of the broad generalities in a minute display of

SOME MODERN PAINTERS

detail, or accidentals. Accidental characteristics attract our attention first, and are in consequence apt to be accentuated, whilst the more general ones are lost sight of and are not insisted upon sufficiently. In this way dignity and nobility are sacrificed to the smaller and meaner qualities.

Before the advent of photography, the miniaturist reigned supreme as the creator of small portraits. In the century which preceded the discovery of the sensitised plate, there existed an unusual demand for miniatures, and the supply was in the hands of miniature painters of every grade of ability. It may at least be said of the worst of these painters, that he depended for his result on his own efforts alone, and he was rightly considered as an honest member of a recognised and necessary branch of portraiture. To-day the position of the indifferent miniaturist is entirely changed, and the old order of things can never return. The unskilled painter must be made to accept honestly the altered conditions, and must not be encouraged in the belief that he is worthy to rank with the artist of real ability and training. He will none the less continue to be in demand as the servant of photography. It is quite certain that there can be no place for him within the portals of that distinguished guild which is to raise the prestige of the art. Its members will be steadfast to those principles which alone can win for it recognition among artists as a serious branch of the profession. They will set their art before their reputations, and their reputations before their incomes.

It has not been an easy task to select a few examples of modern work to illustrate this chapter. Those I have chosen are not characteristic, inasmuch as they represent the work of serious painters who take their art seriously, and show us that there exists a certain independence still amongst a very few of our modern miniaturists. It is this independence, this seriousness, that has appealed to me and makes these miniatures worthy to be ranked with earlier specimens of the art.

MINIATURES

The miniature of the lady in the black hat, by Lionel Heath, speaks for itself (Plate xxxiv.). It shows us conclusively that strength of effect or charm of colour does not depend on pretty local tints, and that grace of pose and composition add interest to the picture and effectiveness to the portraiture. The little child's head, by Helena Horwitz, is a strong and realistic piece of painting, in a broad, painter-like arrangement of light and shade, which seems suggestive of possibilities in an unconventional treatment, though its handling is hardly as spontaneous as its inspiration. Mr. Alyn Williams's head of a girl is as pretty and delicate in its rendering as Miss Alice Mott's portrait of a gentleman is realistic and strong in character-painting (Plate xxxv.). These four examples give us as many different treatments in the modern miniature, all of which may be considered serious, and the fact of reproducing them in close proximity to the work of earlier masters should in itself be an interesting object-lesson to all who have at heart the advancement of this art.

A few figures may throw an interesting side-light on the present state of the profession. In comparing the number of exhibits to-day with the number at the most vigorous period of the eighteenth century renaissance, it will be abundantly proved that quantity does not make a renaissance, but that it is the few good painters who raise the level of a period. In the first exhibition of the Royal Academy in 1769, there were in all only five miniatures, three on enamel and two in water-colours, the latter by Samuel Cotes and Scouler respectively. Nineteen years later, in 1788, the number had increased to about eighty miniatures, and amongst the exhibitors were such well-known favourites as Ozias Humphry with four, Samuel Shelley with five, Nathaniel Plimer with two, Andrew Plimer with three, George Engleheart with three, Edridge with four, James Nixon with one, and Henry Bone with one enamel. In the same year the total number of exhibits at the Academy, including all the works, was



PORTRAIT OF A LADY

BY LIONEL HEATH

PORTRAIT OF A CHILD

BY HELENA HORWITZ

TECHNICAL METHODS

650, so that the miniatures totalled about one-eighth of the whole.

At the present time we have three separate important exhibitions of miniatures in London every year. At the Royal Academy of 1903 there were 245 miniatures hung, at the Society of Miniature Painters 300, and at the Society of Miniaturists rather fewer, I believe. These 800 examples represent only a proportion of the miniatures that are painted in the year, and yet the art was never more lacking in talent or vitality. If the growth of numbers alone is considered, the proportion between miniatures to other works exhibited at the Royal Academy at the present time is a trifle smaller than in 1788, but this diminution is much more than counter-balanced by the numbers sent to other exhibitions.

It is curious to find that the serious miniature painters of to-day are those who take the most pessimistic view of the future of the art. They are inclined to argue that there can never be a popular demand or appreciation for anything but the photographically inspired portrait 'in little.' The photograph is becoming more insistent, and within its limitations, more tasteful every day, and it is therefore hopeless to attempt to educate people to a knowledge of that subtle instinct for art which can grasp at once the essential difference between the sensitively wrought work of an artist, possessing all the nervous susceptibilities for form, colour, effect, and technical expression, and the mechanically accurate likeness that skilfully assumes some of the more positive mannerisms of a well-worn style.

I would answer by pointing out that the artist must be satisfied with the approval of a small minority. He must recognise that he is the master of a foreign language, to understand which the public requires the medium of an interpreter. The cultured minority act the part of interpreters, their enthusiasm and example are infectious, if not their insight and knowledge; and good taste, which is largely a question of imitation,

MINIATURES

gradually spreads downwards, until by force of habit rather than perception the majority will prefer the sound to the unsound, the genuine to the shoddy.

On the other hand, as mechanical processes are perfected, and as superficially trained and talentless painters increase, so there will be an ever-growing demand for the reliable and tasteless substitutes, but there should be no more danger of confounding them with the inspired portrait than of confusing an etching with a process-block.

To conclude, I shall make a few remarks upon the technical methods, implements, and processes of a miniature painter. Facts such as these, except in so far as they may visibly affect the finished picture, or account for some peculiar quality individual to a painter, are to my mind of little helpfulness to the practical student, and may even act as a deterrent to freedom of selection of such methods as are best suited to himself. They are of more interest to the connoisseur, in helping him to determine the correct authorship of a miniature. Every painter has his fads and mannerisms, and all painters know that 'what is one man's meat is another man's poison,' and the futility of laying down the law as to the best tools, colours, or methods. Where one artist requires a brush of the smallest possible size to produce the requisite finish, another will use a full-sized 'goose' for the most minute work; and whilst one painter will lay his tints from the commencement by means of hatchings or diagonal strokes of the brush, another will float the colour on, and stipple only enough to enrich the tone or flatten the surface. The particular colours used for the flesh are supposed to be of very great importance. Personally, I have never found that a successful painter lays much store or stress upon any particular range of colours, unless it is to insist upon the use of the simplest and most permanent ones, and reducing the number down to the smallest possible.

It is true that most artists ultimately drift into a recipe of colour, and find that with certain colours they



A GIRL'S HEAD
BY ALYN WILLIAMS

PORTRAIT OF A GENTLEMAN
BY ALICE MOTT

TECHNICAL METHODS

are able to obtain more easily the effect they desire, but I believe that personal skill has more to do with the choice of pigments than any inherent virtue in the colours themselves. The successful use of a colour depends principally upon the handling, the mixing, and its juxtaposition to other colours. A clever painter will achieve qualities with light red, yellow ochre, and black, which one less skilled could not get using four times as many varieties. The yellows in flesh have always been a source of controversy amongst painters. I should recommend all beginners to try and paint flesh without the use of yellow, and on ivory this is very nearly possible, owing to the natural colour of that material. What is far more to the point is the quality and use of the greys in the flesh. They should be pure and silvery. It is by the tender, delicate, and sensitive use of greys that you may modulate any scheme or harmony of colour, so that it shall be beautiful and convincing. It is this dexterous use of greys which will prevent the rich harmony of colour from being 'foxy' or 'leathery,' and the cool harmony from being 'dirty' or 'black.' In considering the general tone or scheme of colour in the miniature, it is to be remembered that broad and simple masses of colour which are harmonious and low in key, give dignity, and that small spots of pretty complementary tints, skilfully used, give charm and vivacity to the rendering, but are also trivial. The size of the sable used depends primarily on the skill of the operator, but a good rule is to handle as big a one as can possibly be made to do the work; a large brush may have a very fine point, which has the advantage of being kept moist for a much longer period by the full body of the instrument. Nothing is more hampering to freedom and expression than the constant re-moistening of the tip of the brush; it tends to cramp the technique and destroy the full power and sweep of each stroke. In laying the colours, I believe it cannot be too fully recognised that stippling is only a means to an end, and an inevitable means rather than a virtuous

MINIATURES

one. Therefore the colours should be floated on to the ivory, or whatever material is used, and in successive paintings the action should be to 'lick' with the brush in broad 'fat' touches, and with a rapid lift at the end of each stroke, rather than to stipple with the point. Practice and dexterity are really the essence of all success, and will make implements and methods possible which, in the unskilled, would only court disaster. The proper use of a scraper is another important addition to the painter's resources. If a miniature by Cosway or Plimer is examined under a powerful glass, the use of this instrument can often be traced in many places, especially the hair. In ivory miniatures the scraper takes the place of the process of washing or rubbing out on paper or card. The flat edge can be used for reducing spots or excrescences of colour which mar the surface, and to the amateur are an ever-present cause of failure. The best form of scraper is a fine quality of medical lancet. This is made of excellent steel, well tempered and sharp, and it does not lose its edge easily. As to the use of gum with the colours, this is a matter of individual taste, but it should be remembered that much gum is a danger, because in time it will become brittle, and will cause cracks and flaking. Very weak gum-water is all that is sufficient to give an even gloss to the finished miniature, and this may be reserved for quite the last, and then used as a very thin film of varnish. These few remarks cannot possibly exhaust all the difficulties, or methods useful in overcoming them. Every school has had its own ideas with regard to the treatment of a miniature, and every painter his own method of carrying them out. Fashion, temperament, and environment all help to determine treatment, but can have no effect on the golden principles which underlie a work of art.

CHAPTER XI

FOREIGN PORTRAIT MINIATURISTS

IT is of considerable interest to compare the continental phase of the art with our own. We shall find that the English school, apart from the question of its pre-eminence, is distinguished by qualities which are at once national and unique. We have already seen that the same causes were at work over the whole of Europe to account for the decline of the illuminator's art and the independence of the miniaturist as a painter of small portraits. The manuscript miniature was forced to yield to a new and progressive form of the illustrated book, and artists who had learned to gather inspiration from their environment naturally looked for new fields in which to exercise their talents, and give expression to their individualities. The art of portrait miniature was established in France about the same time that Holbein introduced it into England. The talented Clouet family were the first to excel in this new development of the miniature, and their small portraits were closely allied to those painted by Holbein and Hilliard. There exists, so far as I am able to discover, some doubt as to who was the first of the family, and at what date he lived and worked, information concerning this early period being very unreliable. The first mention of the name of Clouet occurs in 1475, when there is an entry in the accounts of Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, to the effect that a certain Jehan Clouet and Henry Bonem have received the sum of thirty-seven livres, four sous, for work done. The latter signs the receipt as carpenter and cabinet-worker, and the former as painter, and tradition declares

MINIATURES

that this is the first of the family of Clouet, although, as Mons. Dimier says, there is nothing to prove any relationship to other painters of the same name. In 1516 the name Jean Clouet appears in the accounts of the French royal household as '*peintre ordinaire*'; this gives us Jean Clouet II., who lived till 1541, and of whose work no example can be identified with any confidence. The earliest known work that has been attributed to the hand of this Clouet is a portrait of the Dauphin François, eldest son of François I., now in the Antwerp Museum. It represents a child of about five or six, and as the Dauphin was born in 1517, it must have been painted about 1523. The excellent little circle portraits in one of the volumes of the *Commentaires de Cesar* are presumably painted by Jean Clouet from 'pattern' drawings which are known to exist. In their treatment they are similar in every way to Holbein's miniatures, the figures being simply and decoratively painted against a blue ground.

In the year 1529 there is a trace of another of the family, in a letter written by Marguerite of Valois from Fontainebleau to the Chancellor d'Alençon, in which she says she has arranged to take into her service '*le peintre, frère de Jannet, peintre du Roy*' (Jannet or Janet was the name adopted by the Clouet family). Whilst some authorities think this must have been a son of Jean Clouet II., and brother of the more famous François, others point out that the date of Jean II.'s death in 1541 makes it probable that the painter mentioned in the letter was his brother, and therefore uncle to François, who did not succeed his father as '*peintre ordinaire et valet de chambre*' until the death of the latter.

Of François Clouet, who is often called Jehannet, sometimes Jannet, but more frequently Janet, there is more known with certainty than of the other members of the family. He was born at Tours between the years 1516 and 1520, and, as I have said, on the death of his father in 1541 was appointed to the vacant position at court, and retained that position under François II. and

FRANÇOIS CLOUET—'JANET'

Charles ix. Various entries in the accounts of the royal household of France show that François Clouet carried on his work up to 1570, when he painted the portrait of Elizabeth, daughter of Maximilian II., on the occasion of her marriage with Charles ix. The portrait of Henri III. at Stafford House must have been painted a decade later.

Of the authentic small portraits by François there is the miniature of Mary Queen of Scots at Windsor, mentioned in Charles I.'s catalogue, and we have at Hampton Court the signed portrait of a boy which is supposed to represent Henri III. at the age of twelve. At the Louvre there are the small full-length portraits of Henri II. about the age of thirty-five, the figure being only 12 inches in height, and Charles ix., which is a copy of the life-size portrait of that king in the Belvedere Gallery at Vienna. In the Jones collection at South Kensington there is the very excellent square miniature in water-colour of the Duc d'Alençon, full length, represented holding the portrait of Elizabeth of England. This would date about the same time as the duke's visit to England to solicit the hand of the virgin queen in 1581. The painting of this miniature is good in every detail except the hands. The duke is wearing a gold embroidered doublet and white ruff and tights; over his shoulders is a black cloak. He stands against a table with a green cover, and the background is a rich red curtain hanging on a grey wall. The whole picture is most minutely finished, the head is excellent in character and drawing, and but for the fact that the legs are too light in tone, and therefore too conspicuous, it would be completely harmonious. At Hamilton Palace there are six small whole-lengths of Henri II., Henri III., Charles ix., Catherine de Medici, Le Grand Dauphin, and Claude of France, and in Dr. Propert's collection there used to be a portrait of François II. All these are painted in oil on copper, except the last, which is on slate. In the Magniac collection at Culworth there is the miniature portrait of the Duc de Guise by Janet, and a portrait of Mary Queen of Scots, also

MINIATURES

probably by the same artist. There is considerable uncertainty about all the work of the Clouet family. It is, however, clear that the character of their portraiture is more Flemish in origin than the work which was in vogue at the time in France. François' work plainly shows that he followed the practice of Van Eyck, and made truth and accuracy his principal aim. R. E. Graves says that 'the delicacy of his form is all the more remarkable from its being rendered through the medium of simple pale tones without any attempt at chiaroscuro.' The miniatures in water-colour by François are exceedingly rare and difficult to authenticate. From the collection at Montagu House I give an illustration of a water-colour miniature representing Marie de Clèves, Princesse de Condé, and catalogued as by J. Clouet, but the dates of the princess's birth and death make it more probable that it is by François (Plate VI.). It is painted in water-colour on a square vellum, with an oval illuminated frame of black and gold round it. The style is very similar to the work of Hilliard, with rather more colour and modelling on the face. In considering the vast number of portrait drawings in European collections attributed to the Clouets, it must be remembered that the demand for portraits during the sixteenth century amounted almost to a craze, and that many who could not afford the painted portrait were satisfied to possess a drawing in chalk. Portraits and drawings of celebrities were duplicated in enormous numbers to supply the demand of the collectors, and there existed what may fairly be considered as a trade in their production. These copies were made by artists without any original ability, but with sufficient skill to catch the leading characteristics of the master's work, so that at this period of time it is sometimes difficult to appreciate the difference between a copy and an original, although, on the other hand, it is often apparent that the duplicates are by the hands of very poor craftsmen indeed. The principal collection of drawings of the Clouet school in England was at Castle Howard, but is now at Chantilly, and almost rivals in

THE CLOUETS' DRAWINGS

number that of the Bibliothèque d'Estampes. This collection includes three hundred drawings, and shows us, as Mons. Bouchet has pointed out, two distinct periods and handlings, the first dating from 1515 to 1540, and the second from 1540 to 1570. The smaller collection at the British Museum, attributed to François, comprises portraits of many of the eminent persons at the French court in Clouet's day. They are somewhat similar in manner to the Holbein drawings, but are more laboured, less spontaneous, and fuller in tone and modelling; the drawing of the features lacks the masterly freedom of expression, and the execution is altogether more tentative. In fact, they cannot really be classed with the finest examples of Holbein's portrait drawings.

The artists who followed in the wake of the Clouets can hardly be said to have carried on their unique facility for portraiture. There were miniature painters, but they divided their attention between portraits, illuminating, engraving, flower and landscape painting; or, like Hans Bol, for instance, who lived from 1543 to 1593, painted minute landscapes, crowded with microscopic figures, in a solid *gouache* method on vellum. Laborde tells us that he also painted miniature portraits, but as in the case of many others of his time, it must remain an uncertainty. To name several other painters who have been credited with occasionally painting miniature portraits, Frederic Brendal, 1580-1651, combined engraving, missal painting, and portraiture, and he taught William Baur, who painted landscapes and seascapes in miniature much oftener than portraits. Samuel Bernard was an engraver and portrait miniaturist. Louis Hans, born in Paris in 1615, and who died there in 1658, is described as '*Louys Hans, bourgeois de Paris et Peintre ordinaire du Roy*,' and had a considerable reputation as a portrait miniaturist. Jacques Bailly painted some portraits, but was chiefly known for his miniatures of flowers and fruit. He was born in 1629 and died in 1679.

The family of Du Guernier are difficult to identify

MINIATURES

with certainty, but it seems clear that Louis Du Guernier, the elder, born in 1550, was a manuscript miniaturist who painted portraits and ornamentations in books of hours and breviaries, and also a fairly large number of miniature portraits on vellum of the most celebrated personages of his time. He also executed for the Duc de Guise a book of prayers in which the ladies of the court were represented with the attributes given to the saints. His eldest son, also named Louis, and not Alexandre, as so many writers erroneously state, was a pupil of his father, and one of the founders of the Academy of Painting, which nominated him professor, 6th July 1655. Mons. Guérin, the then permanent secretary of the Academy, states that Louis Du Guernier the younger died in 1659, whilst still holding this professorship, and not, as Nagler and Siret say, as an exile and martyr to the revocation of the 'Edict of Nantes.' There are other painters of this name supposed to be of the same family—Pierre and François, both miniaturists, but there is nothing, as far as I have been able to discover, to define their true position.

It was not until the beginning of the seventeenth century that France could claim to possess anything approaching a school of miniature portraiture; then it was principally in painting on enamel that artists excelled. The two great originators of this school were Toutin and Petitot, the latter especially being responsible for producing in this method of painting, small portraits of a beauty and delicacy unattempted before and unsurpassed since his time. Petitot's art stands as paramount over other miniaturists on enamel as Cooper's over other miniaturists in water-colour. Great as Petitot's output of miniatures must have been, it is impossible that he can have executed all that have been credited to him. As every portrait in miniature of Cromwell would claim Cooper as its author, so every enamel of Louis XIV. is assumed to be a Petitot.

I shall consider Petitot's enamels at greater length

MINIATURE PORTRAITS IN FRANCE

in another chapter on the subject; it is sufficient to say here that he also painted water-colour miniatures, and that some authorities prefer them to his enamels. The few that I have seen attributed to Petitot are of considerable merit, but cannot pretend to have any qualities of especial distinction.

Petitot formed a school and had numberless followers, a few of whom excelled in water-colour miniatures also. Louis de Châtillon painted elaborate full-length portraits in water-colours, with architectural and landscape backgrounds. The Duke of Buccleuch possesses two very charming examples; they are square miniatures on vellum about $6\frac{1}{2}$ inches by 5. One of Madame de Montespan, seated on a terrace at Versailles, is very delicately finished and full of detail. Her dress is richly ornamented in white, blue, and gold, over which is thrown a blue shawl; by her side is a vase of flowers, and behind her is an orange-bush in a pot, equally realistic. The colouring is excellent, and the drawing and perspective are most daintily conceived and executed. The other miniature is a full-length portrait of the same lady, into which are introduced a parrot and a dog, an equally elaborate dress, and a richly decorated curtain in the background. Though it excels the first in manipulation, it is less pleasing as a picture.

Chéron and Massé both painted in water-colours as well as on enamel—so also did Jacques Antoine Arlaud, whom I have mentioned elsewhere in this book. Peter Paul Seuin painted large and small portraits on vellum. There is one in the Jones collection at South Kensington by P. P. Seuin, signed and dated 1670, of the Viscomte de Turenne, on horseback in classical costume, and it is said that Louis XIV. commissioned it as a present to Madame de Montespan, who succeeded the Duchesse de la Vallière in the favours of that monarch. There is also a miniature of the Earl of Pembroke, signed and dated 1624, at Montagu House. Miniatures by this artist are very scarce.

MINIATURES

The growth of miniature painting at this time was almost entirely due to the court custom of presenting snuff-boxes, *bonbonnières*, and other trinkets, adorned with small portraits or minute subjects of figures and landscapes, often of a doubtful decency. The royal portraits were produced in large quantities, mostly in duplicate for diplomatic gifts, and these were often set in most costly mountings of precious stones, the miniature usually being paid for at a fixed price of 240 francs.

Madame Maubert was one of the State portrait miniaturists to Louis xv., and she seems to have received only 120 francs apiece for her paintings. A miniaturist of the name of Penel painted in 1749 two portraits of Madame la Dauphine and six of Madame Infanti.

Jean Prévost flourished as a miniaturist under Louis xv., and Madame Pompadour ordered of him a large portrait of her royal master for the sum of 1000 francs. Raphael Bachi produced portraits of the same monarch and other notables in wholesale numbers, receiving 240 francs apiece for them.

Nicholas Venevault added many more of Louis and his family. One is especially described as set with 441 brilliants, which cost 23,901 francs, and was presented to M. le Bailly de Solar, ambassador to Sardinia.

Vincent François Élie, born at Geneva, is mentioned in the *Menus Plaisirs* in 1749 as painting the king, the Dauphin, Madame Sophie, Madame Louis and others, receiving the usual sum in payment.

Welper also produced many portraits of Louis xv., to adorn boxes distributed among the Dauphin's suite.

The two Blarenberghes, father and son, must be mentioned for their extraordinary microscopic miniatures, representing crowds of people in village scenes, processions or landscapes, painted in such a minute manner that they were set in snuff-boxes, *bonbonnières*, and even rings. To look at one of these little gems is to be incredulous that the human eye and hand could produce it. The most famous of the Blarenberghes was Louis,

ROSALBA CARRIERA

the son of a Flemish painter who settled in Lille, and died there in 1742. Louis came to Paris and painted fans, snuff-boxes, *bonbonnières*, and other trinkets. His son, Henri Joseph, was born in 1741, and helped him in his work, almost equalling him in execution. Henri died in 1825.

To revert to the court miniaturists again, we find that Mademoiselle Brisson figures in the accounts of the Menus Plaisirs from 1759 to 1761 as painting twelve portraits of the king. Cazaubon was also employed by the Menus Plaisirs during this reign. 'Menus Plaisirs,' or simply 'Les Menus,' was a name formerly given to the expenses of the king, not forming part of the ordinary expenses, such as fêtes, balls, court spectacles, etc. At the Hôtel des Menus Plaisirs, at Paris, Rue du Faubourg-Poissonnière, were the offices of the administration which regulated this kind of expenditure. The building has since been demolished.

The French water-colour miniaturists up to this time, although excellent in their own way, show none of the force of character in the drawing which was so typical of our Cooper school. They are principally distinguished for their prettiness of colour and high finish. At the same time their portraits were mostly of the reigning monarch or members of the court, and were painted generally for diplomatic purposes. Early in the eighteenth century, however, an extraordinary impetus was given to the French art of miniature by the arrival in Paris of the beautiful and gifted Italian, Rosalba Carriera. It is to her that the French owe the creation of a truly national school. The delicate piquancy of her drawing and colour, the graceful charm of her design, were qualities which went straight to the Frenchman's heart. She was at once elected a member of the Academy, and became the centre of an admiring circle of clients and imitators. Like Cosway in England at the end of the century, Rosalba was the vogue, and though she stayed in Paris only a year, her genius gave a great stimulus to the French

MINIATURES

art, and from this time forth miniaturists were almost as numerous in that country as in England during the most flourishing periods. I am glad to be able to give an interesting illustration from a charming portrait of Rosalba by herself, which belongs to the Welbeck collection of the Duke of Portland (Plate xxxvii.). This miniature gives us an excellent idea of her manner. The draperies and hair are painted with solid colour. The background is a low-toned, colourless grey. The bodice is buff and white with pink ribbons, and in her hair are white and pink flowers. The original is sweet and tender in colour, vivacious in expression, and completely French in its inspiration and prettiness.

It is important to include François Boucher, the great French painter, who not only painted portrait miniatures himself, but also stimulated a school of imitators and copyists. His fanciful pastoral scenes, with nymphs and cupids disporting themselves amongst foliage and flowers, were much copied by such miniaturists as Jacques Charlier, who was one of the court painters. Charlier painted in a solid *gouache* method, except in the flesh-tints, which were left transparent. His colour and technique were pretty and tricky, and his daintiness of design and pose were peculiarly national. From the fact of his having received 300 francs apiece for his miniatures instead of the orthodox 240, we may conclude that Charlier's work was considered exceptional.

The art of portraiture in France, whether in big or little, possesses certain distinctions which are peculiar to itself. The buoyant, effervescent temperament of the French people is illustrated in their artists' love of bright, piquant colour and fanciful treatment of accessories. Their miniatures rarely possess great qualities, but are never without some inspiration, even if only of a flippant character. They charm us by their dainty handling of small details, and by their vivacious expression and pose, but they rarely convince us as serious portraits. They appreciate to perfection the art of feminine adornment,



Portrait of a Lady
BY ADOLPHE HALL



Countess du Barri
BY CHARLIER (SIGNED)

PIERRE ADOLPHE HALL

and combine with it a degree of grace which borders on affectation. In the portrait miniature by Charlier illustrated here (Plate xxxvi.), we see this school typified. Although it is a portrait, the likeness is only the secondary consideration: the first is to make a pretty and pleasing picture.

The greatest miniaturist of the French school is Pierre Adolphe Hall, who was a Swede by birth, having been born at Stockholm in 1736. His father, physician to the King of Sweden, destined Adolphe for the medical profession, in which he himself had gained much distinction, and gave him every facility for studying chemistry, anatomy, and botany, under the best professors. But at the age of nineteen Adolphe commenced to draw, and he says in a letter dated 1793, that this new occupation having awakened in him a pronounced taste for the arts, he asked permission of his father to travel, in order to visit places celebrated for their antique monuments, and also the principal galleries of Europe. At first his father raised no objection to this method of completing his son's education, but finding that the latter had no inclination to return to Sweden, he endeavoured to force him to do so by ceasing to supply him with money; without avail, however. Adolphe Hall informs us that in 1760 he finally resolved to abandon medicine for painting, to settle in France, and live by the productions of his pencil. It is not known who was his master, but being intimately connected with such celebrated artists as J. Vernet, Hubert Robert, Greuze, Rosselin, and Madame Le Brun, he must have gathered some excellent precepts and advice, which his natural talents enabled him to profit by. He studiously avoided imitating the methods of contemporary miniaturists, but instead looked to the greater masters Rubens and Van-dyck for guidance, saturating himself with their principles whilst remaining true to his own century.

Hall was a very accomplished artist, painting portraits in oil, pastel, miniature, and on enamel. He was also

MINIATURES

devoted to music and hunting. The Academy of Painting received him as a member in 1769, and the king appointed him his cabinet painter. Although his portraits were in great request, his artistic disposition prevented him from commercialising his talents, and he could never apply himself to his art unless in the mood. His great reputation would have enabled him to acquire a considerable fortune if he had wished. The great ladies, literally crowding at his door, did not easily prevail on him to immortalise their features; and, as often as not, a hunting expedition, or the time devoted to music, made him forget his appointments. Notwithstanding this, he was a rapid worker, and executed sixty to eighty miniatures in a year.

The delicate art of miniature reached its zenith in France under Louis xv. and xvi. The method employed at this period may be described as the contrasting of transparent colour with opaque or *gouache*, allowing the flesh-tints to be painted *à l'aquarelle*, as the French term it, or without white, especially in the shadows, and Hall practised this system with far greater freedom and feeling than any of his rivals. From the great masters he learned his lightness of touch, rich transparency of the shadows and vigour of tone, his harmony and reticence of colour, and suppression of those useless details which give a triviality to the work of his cleverest contemporaries. Nature alone inspired him, and truth of portraiture and characterisation are evident even in those miniatures which he called fancy heads. Many critics of the time asserted that Hall succeeded best with men's portraits, but this, judging from the number of ladies he painted, was not the opinion of the fair sex. We cannot do better than study the examples contained in the Wallace collection, to obtain an excellent idea of his treatment of female portraits (Plate xxxvi.). There we can see over twenty in various treatments and degrees of finish, and all showing the distinctive mark of genius. Notwithstanding the restraint shown in the colour schemes, the rich

ADOLPHE HALL'S MANNER

transparency of the flesh-tints, the free and easy finesse of the draperies, which are painted in solid colours, it is obvious to what school he belongs, in the piquancy of his pose and the vivacity of his expressions, and a certain indefinable use of pretty local colour in small accessories, betraying the French manner. He has borrowed, however, one of the characteristics of our Cooper in the use of sombre neutral tints for the backgrounds, which adds quality to the flesh and effectiveness and dignity to the portraiture.

After the Reign of Terror in France, Hall wandered for some time in Belgium and on the banks of the Rhine, working arduously in order to support his family. He died at Liège in 1793.

The reputation of Adolphe Hall in France was analogous to that of Samuel Cooper amongst ourselves, though, without national prejudice, I may say that to compare him with the English painter is greatly to his disadvantage, and divests his title of '*le Vandyck de la miniature*' of much of its significance. Whatever qualities he may have attained through the study of the great Dutch artist, we are forced to recognise that Hall's art was typically French, and lacked the stern nobility of expression or dignified character which in Vandyck's art reflects its Flemish origin. On the other hand, to compare Hall with his contemporaries, is to recognise at once his great superiority. Other miniaturists found it difficult to rid themselves of the error of thinking that an equal finish of all parts was an essential. They still sometimes used *gouache* in the flesh-tints, with the resulting heaviness, the charming delicacy of the tints of the Swedish artist being a conspicuous contrast to this method. There are a few remaining artists, whom I shall mention, who worked on the eve of those terrible upheavals which did so much to alter the whole conditions of society.

Karl Gustav Klingstedt painted small pictures for snuff-boxes, as well as portraits. He was born at Riga in 1657, and started life in the army. In 1690 he gave up

MINIATURES

the military profession for the arts, and was known principally for his paintings of doubtful subjects on fancy boxes, rather than for his portraits. There are examples of his work in Mr. Jeffery Whitehead's collection, the Wallace collection, and others. He died in Paris in 1734.

Joseph Ducreux was born in 1734 and died in 1803. He divided his attention between oil, pastel, and miniature. He painted the portrait of the Archduchess Marie Antoinette on her engagement to the Dauphin, and he also saw the final scene of their unfortunate reign, for he drew a portrait of Louis XVI. just as he was leaving the Temple for the scaffold. M. Charles Blanc says of the drawing, that 'the courage, the fixed eye and worn face, made him shudder as he gazed on it.'

Joseph Boze, 1746-1831, was a talented miniaturist who suffered for his courage in giving evidence in favour of Marie Antoinette, and was thrown into prison, only escaping the guillotine by the death of Robespierre.

F. Campana was also connected with this ill-fated queen, and he painted several portraits of her and other members of the royal family for the usual diplomatic presents.

The French Revolution, in destroying the corrupt and elegant society of the day, dealt a fatal blow at the graceful art of miniature. This cherished art of the boudoir was unsuited to the austere Republicans. There were still miniaturists, but their numbers diminished considerably. Less appreciated, their art fell into decay; it lost that freedom and lightness of touch so well suited to its dimensions, and it was not until the rise of Napoleon that the decadence was checked by the genius of Jean Baptiste Isabey. This painter was born at Nancy in 1767, and died at Paris in 1855. If the importance of a painter can be correctly gauged by the number of his celebrated sitters, then Isabey outrivals the greatest in this respect. There was hardly a famous person in Europe whom he did not paint. During his youth at Nancy he studied landscape and miniature painting under

JEAN BAPTISTE ISABEY

Claudot. At the age of eighteen, in 1785, he went to Paris, with a recommendation to Dumont, who took some interest in the direction of his studies. At this time young Isabey earned a somewhat precarious living by painting fancy miniatures for a toy-seller at six or seven francs apiece, or pastels for a picture-dealer. Isabey also worked at the accessories of some of David's pictures, and may be correctly described as the pupil of Dumont, David, and Girardet. His beautiful drawing of 'La Barque,' his studies *à la manière noire*, made his name popular, and the heroes of the Convention posed to him for their portraits. It was at Malmaison that he executed his first full-length portrait of Napoleon, who congratulated him on his success. Isabey became the intimate friend of the First Consul, and through his influence and introduction painted and drew a numberless array of royalties and nobilities of every court in Europe, and received many honours from them.

The work of Isabey may be divided into three principal groups: the first, the drawings and portraits, a large number of lithographs and caricatures which appeared under the Directory; the second, his sepia drawings, etc.; and the third, his large and small miniatures.

Examples of Isabey's miniatures are frequently met with, and there are many in all the well-known collections throughout Europe. The Wallace collection is particularly rich in examples of his large miniature portraits.

Isabey evolved the idea, which was new in France, of substituting paper for ivory in order to abridge his labours and fulfil the numerous demands for portraits by which he was assailed. The use of ivory requires great precautions in the technical management of the colour, and in adopting paper he executed his miniatures without the use of *gouache*, suppressing almost entirely the backgrounds, draperies, and accessories, to attain greater rapidity, much for the same reason that Cosway produced his 'stained pencil-drawings.' These slight drawings were in no way an indication of incapacity, as Isabey had

MINIATURES

already given proofs of considerable talent in the display of the various resources of his art. To still further prove his ability, in 1817 he exhibited the 'Escalier du Louvre,' a miniature on paper which measures 10 inches in height by 25 inches in width. It possesses all the vigour of a painting in oil, and contains an accumulation of difficulties—the most complicated details of architecture, and a remarkable imitation of the richest and most varied stuffs. The new transparent manner of painting which Isabey brought into use, called by the French *aquarelle*, formed a school which was distinct from the older method of *gouache*, and in fact was really an adoption of the methods which had been practised in England since the advent of the ivory miniature. In relation to this, it is interesting to quote the opinion of M. Villot, who says: 'Whatever incontestable superiority has been shown by Messrs. Ross and Thorburn in England and Mmes. de Mirbel and Herbelin in France, I persist in thinking that there is more art and charm in a clever contrasting of opaque and transparent colour, by which one may render any kind of texture without becoming monotonous; and that finally, it is absolutely necessary to return to the admirable method of Hall, if we wish to attempt to save the miniature, now expiring under the blows of its hideous and implacable enemy, coloured photography.'

Jean Baptiste Jacques Augustin, miniaturist and enameller, was born at Saint Dié in 1759 and died at Paris in 1832. Being without fortune, his only master was nature. At the age of twenty-two he went to Paris, and some writers have said that his first attempts there produced a veritable revolution in art. His miniatures have been considered as only second to those of Isabey; and his style was certainly a reaction against the prevailing Pompadour manner, and has many good qualities of design and colour.

Especial notice must be made of Madame Lizenska Aimée Zoe de Mirbel, one of Augustin's pupils. She was

MADAME DE MIRBEL

born at Cherbourg in 1796, dying at Paris in 1849. Her charms of person and intellect enabled her to rapidly take a leading place as miniaturist under Louis XVIII., Charles X., and Louis Philippe, the latter making her miniature painter to his court. Dr. Propert, speaking of her work, says: 'She combined breadth of treatment with delicate finish in a manner rarely met with.' There is an excellent specimen of her miniature work in the Wallace collection, and also two very clever water-colour portraits on paper of Sir Walter Scott and Fenimore Cooper, probably executed in 1826 when they were visiting Paris. The drawings are very much in the manner of contemporary English water-colourists, the faces being freely drawn and delicately coloured, whilst the coats are painted in cool sepia.

Richard Masson was also appointed painter and *valet-de-chambre* to Louis XVIII. Jean Guérin was a fellow-pupil with Isabey in the studio of David. His works are little known, though he painted portraits of Louis XVI. and his queen; and a series of engravings by Fusinger of the most prominent deputies of the National Assembly, and also the generals of the Republic, were taken from miniatures by Guérin. He distinguished himself as a member of the National Guard at the Tuileries on June 20, 1792, when he assisted, at the peril of his life, in the protection of the royal family against the fury of the mob. There are examples of his miniatures in the Wallace collection.

Louis Francis Aubrey learned the art from Vincent and Isabey; he obtained several medals, and was decorated in 1822. A miniature by him of Caroline Bonaparte is in the collection just mentioned. Daniel Saint (1778-1847) was considered a worthy rival of Isabey and Madame de Mirbel. We have two examples of his work at Hertford House, one of which is a portrait of the Emperor Napoleon. Of Jean Sicardi there is very little known. Dr. Propert tells us that he probably painted more portraits of Louis XVI. than any other artist,

MINIATURES

for which he received from 350 to 450 francs each, a larger sum than any contemporary artist except Hall. The boxes in which they were mounted were very costly, as much as 24,830 francs being mentioned as the value of one. At the Wallace Galleries there are several very charming examples of portrait miniatures by Sicardi, painted in a fanciful manner. They are enamel-like in their quality of flesh-painting, and pretty in colour. Amongst them is a portrait of Louis XVI. in early manhood. Sicardi had as a pupil Simon Jacques Rochard (1788-1872), who, although he was born and learned his art in Paris, is principally associated with our English court. Rochard learned his first lessons from Mademoiselle Bounieu, and also studied at the École des Beaux Arts. At the age of twenty he painted a portrait of the Empress Josephine for the Emperor. At Brussels he was extensively employed by the English officers and other members of the cosmopolitan society then gathered there. He also painted a miniature of the Prince of Orange for his bride in 1815. Soon after this he came to London and was for many years a favourite court painter. Princess Charlotte, the Duchess of York, the Duke of Cambridge, and the Duke of Devonshire sat to him. When the Czar of Russia visited England, Rochard painted six miniatures of the Czarewitch for snuff-boxes to be presented to the English noblemen attached to the Czar's person. Although French by birth and training, Rochard shows us that he was completely English in his treatment of a portrait, being mainly influenced by our contemporary painters, Reynolds and Lawrence. His work is quite equal to that of the other miniature painters of the time in England.

François Rochard, a brother of Simon, also came to London and made a considerable reputation as a miniaturist, painting many notable people. He exhibited here between the years 1820 and 1855. As in the case of his brother, we may see in his manner of treatment the influence that the English school exercised on his work.

A SENTIMENT OF FRIVOLITY

The miniature of Princess Charlotte (Plate xxvii.) gives an excellent idea of his style.

Mansion was also an excellent portrait miniaturist of this time, possessing many of the qualities of Isabey, but firmer and less obviously laboured than the better known painter. There are several very good examples of direct portraiture by Mansion in the collection at Hertford House. The original of the one illustrated here is certainly the best painted and the most charming in subject (Plate xxxviii.).

The list of miniature painters given here does not nearly exhaust the French artists who painted 'in little.' There were very few leading portrait painters who did not occasionally amuse themselves with painting small pictures and portraits on ivory, in *gouache*, which has always been the favourite method with French water-colourists. Charming as these little French pictures are in fancy, in daintiness of colour and excellence of drawing, they mostly lack that seriousness of motive which makes for the really great school of portraiture. They are piquant, playful, and animated, but when the more sustained effort at characterisation is realised, as in the work of Isabey, it is apt to be trivial, small in technique, and lacking reticence in colour, though always good in drawing. We can find nothing analogous to the school of portraiture which Vandyck founded, or that of Sir Joshua Reynolds. Rosalba's art, if we consider it French, though more solid and broader in its technical qualities, is too pretty and varied in its harmony of colours to possess great distinction.

The fashion for decorated snuff-boxes and *bonbonnières*, stimulating as it did the production of numberless small and graceful designs and miniature portraits to adorn the lids, seems to have tainted the art of miniature with a sentiment of frivolity which even the portraitists were unable to free themselves from. Adolphe Hall alone, of all the later exponents of the French school, most nearly reached a noble conception of the portrait.

MINIATURES

As I have said, there were many miniature portraits painted by French oil painters: Jean B. Greuze and François Boucher both produced most excellent ones. In conclusion, I will mention a few other of the more important artists who are responsible for really good small portraits, such as Mignard, De Troy, Santerre, Rigaud, and Boulogne; and there are also well-known examples by Louis Périn, pupil of Sicardi, Antoine Vestier, François Dumont, Largillière, and Jean Marc Nattier, who was portrait painter to Louis xiv., and succeeded admirably in *gouache* miniatures. Portraits by Nattier of Marshal Saxe, the Duchesse de Villars, and Madame de Pompadour, have been exhibited in England.

GERMAN AND NETHERLANDISH SCHOOLS

The German and Netherlandish art of portraiture sprang direct from the manuscript miniature of the Flemish school, as indeed our own had also, through the work of Holbein.

The wonderful creations of the brilliant outburst of painting in Flanders, early in the fifteenth century, awoke an inspiration which took nature as its supreme guide. Van Eyck breathed a new and vigorous life into the art; his men and women possessed a vitality and naturalism unrealised before. His madonnas and saints were studied direct from nature, and were in the real sense portraits; and if they were sometimes of too plebeian a character, the reserve of expression and absence of all affectation of pose ennobled the type and gave a divinity of feeling which an insipid idealism would lack. This school grasped the great fundamental principles of portraiture, and its revelations spread a healthy influence throughout the whole of northern Europe. All the masters of Holland gathered their inspirations from this source, and Germany sent her artists to study under Flemish painters, and in this way they also were closely connected with the great creator of the school.

GERMAN MINIATURE PORTRAITS

When we consider the miniaturists of these countries, we must remember that they rarely confined themselves to working in a single medium. They were craftsmen who worked at painting, illuminating, engraving, wood-carving, or even architecture and sculpture, as opportunity offered.

Of the German school, Lucas Cranach, 1470-1553, a contemporary of Albert Dürer, is about the earliest painter to produce a miniature portrait. I have already alluded to a portrait by him in the Montagu House collection, of Erasmus, which is reminiscent of Holbein's manner.

Cranach excelled in various mediums of expression, and exercised his wonderful gift of portraiture in oil, in engraving, or in remarkable portrait medallions in wood. He executed miniature portraits of the Elector of Saxony and of the Reformers. Lucas Cranach, the younger, inherited his father's ability for portraiture, though he exhibited less reserve in his colouring.

I have given an account in an earlier chapter of many of the painters who practised portraiture at this time either in Germany or the Netherlands, and produced examples of miniatures, most of which were executed in oil.

One of the earliest Flemish miniaturists mentioned is Louis Janseen Bos, 1450-1507. His portraits are very wonderfully finished, and he also painted miniatures of fruit and flowers with insects upon them, with incredible detail.

Jan Brueghel, who was born at Brussels in 1568, produced many water-colour miniatures. Later he took to oil painting, and his skill in landscape was such that Rubens asked him to collaborate with him in putting the backgrounds to many of his pictures.

Jean Baptiste Deynum, a native of Antwerp, born in 1620, was much employed as a portrait miniaturist, and worked in distemper. Philippus Fruytiers, a fellow-townsmen and born in the same year, devoted himself entirely to portrait miniatures, and was employed by Rubens to

MINIATURES

paint himself and family in miniature, which was done completely to the great painter's satisfaction.

Next we have Joseph Werner, a Swiss, who began life by painting in oil and fresco, but being partial to a great amount of finish he ultimately took to miniature portraits, which he carried to great perfection. He journeyed to France and was employed by Louis xv., then to Austria, and from there to Berlin, being patronised by the various courts.

Nicholas Cramer, born at Leyden in 1670, rose to considerable fame as a portrait miniaturist; and the family of Valkenburg of Malines includes three painters of landscapes and miniature portraits.

Constantin Friedrich Blessendorf of Berlin; Jacob Christoph Le Blond of Frankfort, who settled in Amsterdam; Balthasar Vanden Bosch of Antwerp, who painted a large miniature of the Duke of Marlborough on horseback, which created quite a sensation at the time, all belong to the late seventeenth century. Then there are two ladies, Anna Vasser, who was born at Zurich in 1679, and died in 1713; and Henrietta Wolters, a native of Amsterdam, born in 1692. The latter, taking Vandyck as her model, copied some of his works with great success.

Gerard Melder, also of Amsterdam, born in 1693, showed his artistic bent early, and copied some miniatures by Rosalba, attaining considerable reputation. The two Mengs, father and son, Ishmael and Antonio Raffaele Mengs, also the latter's sister Julia, painted miniatures. Georg Baur, Johann Friedrich Beer, Johann Melchior Dinglinger, Georg Friedrich, his brother, and Sophie, a sister, were all good miniaturists and celebrated in the seventeenth century.

Carl Friedrich Thienpondt, who was born at Berlin in 1720, and died in 1796, produced excellent enamel miniatures.

Bekking, the Dutch artist, was eminent as a miniaturist at the end of the eighteenth century.

HEINRICH FRIEDRICH FÜGER

Ignaz Bergmann, a Viennese, became celebrated for his family groups in miniature.

The two sisters Bichelberger both practised at the Hague in the late eighteenth century.

Johann Samuel Blachner, born in 1771, was known as a miniaturist at the age of fifteen. He was employed by the court, and painted the Princess of Courland many times.

The most notable miniaturist belonging to these countries in the eighteenth century is Heinrich Friedrich Füger, who was born at Heilbronn in 1751, and died at Vienna in 1818. He first learned painting at Stuttgart, but in 1774, when he went to Vienna, he was patronised by Queen Maria Theresa, by whose assistance he was enabled to visit Rome, where he studied from the antique and the great masters. He was appointed Director of the Imperial Academy at Vienna in 1783. He has been correctly called the Cosway of Vienna; his colour drawing and refinement are suggestive of our countryman, although his work is very unequal, and is as a rule more solid in tone. The beautiful example here reproduced belongs to Mr. Henry Drake, and is set in the lid of a Vernis Martin *bonbonnière* (Plate xxxvii.).

It would be easy, but hardly profitable, to add further names to this list of miniaturists, in the limited space at my disposal. It is quite clear that these schools of miniature took the art of portraiture much more seriously than their French cousins, and though in the later period we find a more modified expression and greater freedom, their inherited traditions are always discernible.

As a catalogue of reference for the names of foreign miniaturists, the reader may refer to Mons. Albert Jaffé's *Miniatur-Katalog*, which is illustrated with numerous small reproductions. Mons. Jaffé claims that his catalogue is more complete than any existing one. It certainly contains more names, but this fact does not, I think, necessarily render it more complete, as it is impossible to exhaust the list of painters of miniatures. Mons. Jaffé

MINIATURES

himself omits such miniaturists as Leo Lehmann, 1776-1859, and his contemporaries Aldenrath and Gröger of Hamburg, all being of considerable repute in their day. The miniatures I have seen by the first-named artist are excellent in drawing, being a little reminiscent of our Andrew Robertson or Sir William Ross, and are painted with transparent flesh-colour. A catalogue that includes such names as Kneller, Reynolds, and Romney, might with even more reason give Gerard Dow or the Spanish painter Goya, not to mention others who have certainly painted miniatures.

ITALIAN SCHOOL

The Italian school has produced but few portrait miniaturists. Its great inherited glories and its magnificent renaissance of painting were the fruits of larger and nobler conceptions. The Italian art of painting almost ignored the cabinet picture, and revelled in the wider fields of fresco, or the more inspiring themes of religion and mythology. Its object was to adorn the palace and the church, not the home and the boudoir. Nevertheless, we have already seen that the celebrated Clovio could produce as excellent a portrait in miniature as any of his contemporaries, and a few other Italians may be named as having produced miniature portraits quite worthy of their country. Giovanni Antonio Licinio, known as Il Pordenone, born in 1484, is said to have so nearly approached Titian in power, that the great Venetian painter pursued him with a deadly hatred, and on the death of Licinio in 1540 it was strongly suspected that poison had been the cause.

Bernardo Buontalenti, called Dalle Girandole, was a genius of many gifts. He studied painting under Salviati and Bronzino, sculpture under Michael Angelo, and architecture under Giorgio Vasari, and finally, miniature painting under Giulio Clovio. He was also a great mechanic and an excellent mathematician. It was as an



ROSALBA CARRIERA
BY HERSELF



PORTRAIT OF A LADY
BY HEINSOR



PROFILE HEAD
BY FREDERIC H. FÜGER

ITALIAN PAINTINGS 'IN LITTLE'

architect in connection with fortifications that he was most celebrated; but he executed a number of miniatures for Francesco, the son of Cosmo I. He died in 1608.

Giulio Campagnola was one of those who painted portraits as part of the illumination of manuscripts. Sophonisba Anguisciola of Cremona was a pupil of Bernardino Campi, and was famous as a portrait painter. Philip II. of Spain invited her to Madrid in 1560, where she taught painting to the Queen of Spain and her sister. Sophonisba had three sisters who were only less excellent than herself in painting miniatures, and she also had a pupil, Johann Baptiste Anticone, who practised in Naples towards the end of the sixteenth century.

Leonardo Corona excelled in copying the works of Titian, and founded his style on that master. Girolamo Amalteo painted portraits and other subjects in miniature at the beginning of the seventeenth century, but died young.

Giovanna Garzoni and Giovanna Fratellini were both lady artists of distinction. The former flourished about 1630, and was employed by various members of the Medici family and the Florentine nobility; and the latter, also of Florence, where she was born in 1666, painted in oil, water-colours, and crayons. She was employed at the court of Cosmo III. as a miniature portrait painter, and her pastels are said to be not inferior to those of Rosalba.

Ippolito Galantini, called Il Cappucino, and Padre Felice Ramelli, were two ecclesiastics who gained celebrity as miniaturists. The former taught art to Giovanna Fratellini, and the latter was invited by the King of Sardinia to his court, where he was largely employed to paint portraits, and amongst other works he executed miniatures of the most celebrated painters, copied from the originals in the Florentine Gallery.

Giovanna Marmocchini was taught by Galantini, and was the favourite painter of the Grand Duchess of Tuscany.

MINIATURES

By far the most distinguished Italian miniaturist of the eighteenth century was Rosalba Carriera, who, as we have already seen, created so much sensation in Paris. Rosalba, or, as she was christened, Rosa Alba, was born at Venice about 1675. Her father, Andrea Carriera, who had some aptitude for drawing and painting, gave Rosalba her first lessons, and she helped her mother by composing and drawing patterns for the point lace for which Venice was famous. From Giuseppe Diamantini, Rosalba gained her first serious knowledge of painting, and later Pietro Liberi influenced the young aspirant to a considerable extent. One of the youthful Venetian's earliest and most influential patrons was the King of Poland, who had a passionate admiration for her talent, and bought several of her miniatures for his cabinets. It was about the year 1700 that Rosalba's fame as a painter of portraits 'in little' spread beyond her native country, due in great measure to the numerous foreign officers who passed through Venice during that turbulent time, and visited her studio. The charm of her work and the fascination of her personality won her an overwhelming number of commissions. In 1709 Frederick iv., King of Denmark, had his portrait painted by Rosalba, also ordering miniature portraits of the twelve prettiest Venetians. Later, in Florence, this king was painted by Giovanna Fratellini, who was Rosalba's principal rival, but a general comparison of their work was strongly in favour of the Venetian. It has been said that Rosalba was the first to excel in pastel portraits: certainly her reputation in this medium was little less than that which she achieved in water-colours (Plate xxxvii.).

Rosalba received many honours and was elected a member of the Academies of St. Luke, Bologna, and Florence, and her portrait is included in the Uffizi Gallery. On her arrival in Paris in 1720 she painted Louis xv., then a boy of ten years, and other members of the French court; she also became the friend and intimate of many distinguished artists and amateurs. Pierre Crozat, the



PORTRAIT OF A LADY

(French)

AFTER MANSSON

ORIENTAL ART

critic and collector, Mariette the writer, the Count de Caylus, Watteau, Rigaud, Largillière, and Antoine Coypel, painter to the Regent and director of the Royal Academy, all honoured her with their friendship and admiration. Coypel, who was the keeper of the king's drawings, bought one of her drawings for two hundred francs for the royal collection, and presented her to the Academy of Painting. In her diary of her year's stay in Paris we may read much that is interesting respecting the society of the regency. There is no doubt that the constant strain of her numerous commissions was the cause of her eyesight failing some years before her death, which took place at Venice in 1757.

Scipio Capello, Giuseppe Baldrighi, Giuseppe Longhi, and Bianca and Matilda Festa, all belong to the latter end of the eighteenth century, and were skilled miniaturists.

Le Chevalier Pompeo Battoni, born in 1708 at Rome, and who died in 1787, painted a large number of the celebrities of the time in miniature. Like so many others, he started life as a jeweller, and first commenced painting by copying a miniature on a snuff-box which had been entrusted to him for repair.

Sophie Giordano painted very good miniatures, and Agazzi and Antonio Alessandria were miniaturists, all of whom worked at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

ORIENTAL

In a general historical sketch of foreign miniatures, Oriental art must have some consideration given to it, though it is necessary to limit my remarks to the briefest outline of facts.

The origin and development of the art of Eastern countries is most involved. Although each nation possesses characteristics peculiar to itself, in their general principles they are very closely interwoven, and so we find that the phase of their art of which we are speaking,

MINIATURES

that of miniature painting, conforms itself to certain Asiatic motives common to all.

The Persian art of painting has influenced and dominated that of India from very early times. Hindoo artists were too fond of the plastic arts to devote themselves with any degree of energy to the more studious art of painting; and although their work in this direction is not wanting in technical qualities, they paint as though illuminating a flat surface; their figures conform themselves to a conventional type, the traditions of which are preserved for them in the sculptures of their temples. The proportions of the figures, the attitudes and expressions, are always the same in both branches of art.

As Mons. Maurice Maindron tells us: 'If we wish to obtain an idea of the native Hindoo art of painting, we must study, not their miniatures and portraits, ancient and modern, but all the representations of divinities, executed in *gouache* or in varnish applied to glass.' The *gouache* is generally done on stout paper or sheets of talc; and here we find that gods and goddesses are represented with a carefulness, an elegance of form and composition, and a command of colour which compel our attention. In these paintings the most vivid colours are opposed to one another without seeming to clash, and it is in this unique power that we recognise the most admirable characteristic of Oriental painting. The colours are laid on in flat tints, and there is hardly any attempt at modelling. Gold and silver are applied in places to enrich the costumes, which in the pictures of gods are thickly encrusted with jewellery.

It is in this elaboration and richness of detail and ornamentation that the artists spend all their pains. They have never taken the least trouble to represent nature, but are content in having attained a power of illuminating tastefully, under fixed traditional rules and designs which, from a decorative point of view, may be considered analogous to the art of the Middle Ages.

Although the history of the art of painting in India is

PERSIAN MINIATURES

a record of decadence, there is the evidence of the frescoes in the Buddhist caves of Ajunta to prove that in ancient India the art was carried to a great degree of excellence. Mons. G. Le Bon unhesitatingly declares that, at the period when these remarkable frescoes were painted, about the seventh century, no artist could have been found in Europe capable of executing them.

The Persian art of painting, on the other hand, shows much more vitality. It has been built up by a fusion of ideas and inspirations of many different races, dating from the earliest periods known to history. It gathered, during its ascendancy, from the Egyptians, the Assyrians, and Asiatic Greeks, and in turn the Tartar, Mongol, and Afghan dynasties, which succeeded one another and overran the Persian Empire, brought with them the preferences of the peoples they represented. Thus we find that Persian art is composite in its character, and has only a distant connection with Arabian art from which it drew its earliest beginnings, and in one particular may be considered in complete discordance with it. Arabic art had an inherited repugnance to depicting the human form, which repugnance can be traced at every step in the history of the nations of the East. Persian art, on the contrary, represented animated forms, and is essentially graphic in its character. The Persian artist was a careful draughtsman, who represented things more or less on a flat plane in outline and rich mosaic of colour and pattern.

Ispahan was famous for its calligraphers, whose renown spread through all the Mussulman East. In their books, which are rare, we find all the resources of the art of the miniaturist and of the designer. At times the whole background of the page is filled with arabesques of gold, with elaborate hunting-scenes, and at other times it is only the border which is illuminated. Mons. A. Gayet describes how a manuscript of the story of Yousouf and Loulikaha, written by Abderrhaman Ibu-Ahmed-el-Gami, who died in 891, has margins thus illuminated, with a

MINIATURES

cleverness which surpasses that of the European designers of the Middle Ages. The headings of the chapters are like exquisite lacework in brilliant tones.

Unlike Indian painting, that of Persia proves beyond doubt that the talent of the miniaturist was not a question of practice and routine alone, for out of a hundred manuscripts, no two repeat the same decoration. The Persian painter shows himself to be a dreamer and an idealist, who uses his knowledge of nature to convey a poetic and romantic story to the spectator. He prefers the melancholy and serene aspects of nature, the softened tones of twilight or the intensity of the setting sun; he never studies nature for herself, but only to harmonise her with his dreams. He is also a master in the use of colour, and obtains much of his effect by a clever use of complementary tones, using at the same time white, black, or gold. He has little idea of the anatomy of the human form, and never succeeds in giving a lifelike representation of it, but the figures, with calm indifference, take their part in the romantic scene, which is treated with a master hand.

As a portraitist, the Persian artist shows himself a remarkable draughtsman of the physiognomy. Without much modelling, with only a few strokes, he contrives to give great expression. Only the essential characteristics of the countenance are indicated, the line of the eyebrows, the undulations of the hair and beard, the definition of the eyes and lids and mouth.

At the time the Renaissance was in progress in Europe, at the commencement of the sixteenth century, there arose the school of Ahmed-Febryzy. The chief of these celebrated painters were Djehanghyr, Bokhary, and Behzade. The last-named and best known is representative of all, and was born at Herat about 1515. Authorities credit him with attaining great technical perfection, together with a true instinct of the philosophy of things. Mons. Gayet says he was a great artist in the true acceptance of the term; he attempted every *genre*

PERSIAN MINIATURES

in turn. Like the early Renaissance painters, he displayed the love of nature, and painted it with a sort of mystic piety, borrowed from the tales of Saadi and Hafiz. True to his nationality, he preferred the melancholy of twilight, the languor of the dying day, the sadness of valleys shut in by great bare rocks of sombre hue, bare trees outlining their dead branches against the sky.

In studying the manner of these early Persian masters, it seems probable that they gained much from the Chinese through the medium of the Mongols, and that with the materials, such as vellum and colours, which are known to have been imported from Chinese workshops, the works of Chinese painters were brought to serve as models in Persian studios.

At the end of the sixteenth century, a painter of Indian birth named Mani was the originator of another progressive school of painting, in which an imperfect knowledge of perspective replaces the usual conventional treatment. This school gradually reached its zenith, and a pupil of Mani, named Shoudja-ed-Daoulah, who achieved all his master's excellences, has been credited with being the head of an artistic evolution which in the seventeenth century had the result of introducing into Persian painting something of the school of Watteau. Be this as it may, this artist was an excellent portraitist, as was also Kapour, another painter of the same school. Timour, one of its most brilliant representatives, painted a number of little pictures where crowds of persons are in action, the naturalness of which is admirable.

Through the Western influences that sway these artists, there can always be traced the Mongol elements. Chinese forms are constantly used in the details of costume, architecture, and landscapes. Bahzade's figures are always Mongolian in type, and two of his most important pictures have for their subject the marriage fête of the daughter of a Chinese emperor with a Persian sovereign.

If Chinese art can claim to have influenced Persian

MINIATURES

art to some degree, it certainly influenced the art of Japan to a far greater degree.

The beginnings of the art of Japan will always remain, even for the Japanese, in complete obscurity. The oldest picture known to exist was executed in the ninth century under the Emperor Souiko. It represents the propagator of Buddhism in Japan, the Regent Shiotokou Daishi.

Kose Kanaoka, a painter and poet of the ninth century, has always been considered by the Japanese as their most famous old master. In the year 880 he executed portraits of Confucius and other philosophers of China for the Emperor Yosei. But he did not confine himself to portraiture, for he excelled in painting animals and landscape. The works by this artist that still exist show considerable vigour combined with delicacy, and are very highly valued.

Three centuries later a new influence was at work on the character of Japanese art. This originated with Toba Sôjo, an artist who showed a strong vein of humour, and was perhaps the first exponent of the humorous style brought to such perfection in the seventeenth century by Itshio. Previous to the twelfth century Chinese art had remained comparatively in its infancy, but at this period the art of painting began to develop a really original style; then it was that the Emperor Kijô, of the dynasty of the Mings, founded the school the principles of which were retained until the seventeenth century. Its chief characteristic was a method of rapid sketching by means of a few vigorous strokes, and this school ultimately in the fourteenth century spread its influence to Japan, and under Meitshio produced a rival school to the school of Tosa, which had been founded by Tsounetaka, painter to the Imperial Court in the thirteenth century, and whose descendants adopted the name of Tosa, the province of which he was under-governor.

The impulse given to the imported Chinese method, or school of rapid sketching, was largely due to a pupil of

JAPANESE MINIATURISTS

Meitshio, a Chinese artist named Josetsou, naturalised in Japan. On the other hand, the distinctive characteristics of the school of Tosa, owing nothing to Chinese influence, exist to-day and hold an unique place in Japanese art. In the minute detail and extremely careful finish of this school we can trace considerable resemblance to Persian miniatures. Mons. Louis Gonse tells us that he has seen quails, peacocks, cocks, branches of cherry-blossom, and bouquets of roses which would have done honour to the brush of a Flemish miniaturist. The artists of this school painted historical scenes, court festivals, etc., in albums, *makimonos*, and on screens. They worked with very fine brushes, and were fond of using gold leaf in the backgrounds to heighten the brilliancy of their colouring.

Kakemonos are paintings on silk or paper, elegantly enframed with bands of plain or figured stuffs, mounted on a sheet of thick paper, and rolled on a light cylinder of pine-wood, ornamented at the ends with ivory, horn, or plain or lacquered wood. The *makimono* is a roll smaller in size but longer.

The screens of the school of Tosa resemble vast missals with gold backgrounds. In fact, this style of painting was in all respects similar to the illuminated miniature, executed in a kind of *gouache*, the figures being coloured and modelled with careful delicacy. In it we see the undeniable influence of Persian art, in certain forms of decoration and details of ornamentation, in the drawing of the figures, their draperies and extremities.

Of all the Japanese masters, it is Hokusai who appeals most to our European tastes. In our eyes he possesses the gifts and technical attainments which make a great artist without distinction of time or country. He has force, originality, versatility, humour, and taste in drawing, added to an extraordinary dexterity. His work shows us the pictorial history of a whole people. To quote Mons. Louis Gonse, 'He is at once the Rembrandt, the Callot, the Goya, and the Daumier of Japan,' and I

MINIATURES

might add, the Hogarth and the Morland. Hokusai, as the artist of the people, is ignored, if not despised, by the noble class. He has not influenced at all the aristocratic schools of Kioto, but his effect on the vulgar school and on the secondary arts has been decisive. He was born in 1760 in a district of Yedo, and died in 1849, and was buried in the Buddhist temple of Sai-Kiodji at Yedo.

Dr. W. Anderson, who spent several years in Japan, as professor at the medical university of Tokio, devoted himself to researches in the art of Japan. He formed on the spot a large library of Japanese books, and made an excellent collection of nearly two thousand *kakemonos*, *makimonos*, and painted albums, in which are specimens of all the schools of painting and the principal masters. This collection was acquired by the British Museum at the price of £3000. Mr. Fenollosa, an American gentleman who was a member of the Academy of Kano, has collected more than five thousand examples of Japanese painting, and Dr. Gierke of Berlin has also made a very valuable collection, comprising many original drawings by some of the principal artists of Japan, and these are now in the Museum at Berlin.

CHAPTER XII

MINIATURES ON ENAMEL

IN a work on the art of miniature painting it is important to include a short review of the miniatures which have been painted on enamel. Seventeenth and eighteenth century miniaturists often worked in the two methods—in water-colour on vellum, card, or ivory—and in vitrifiable colours on copper, gold, or silver, which had been first prepared with a white enamel surface. When completed, the picture was fired, which rendered it practically indestructible.

It would be obviously out of place here to give even the shortest history of the art of enamelling. It is my intention to confine myself to that phase of the art, of which Toutin and Petitot may be considered the first real exponents. Portraits *in* enamel were produced long before their time, but they could in no way be classed as miniatures, their comparative crudity and lack of detail placing them in the category of decorative and ornamental art. I will, however, give a short description of the methods employed by mediæval enamellers, in order to show how the processes developed, and gradually changed from painting *in* enamel to painting *on* enamel in the manner which was brought to such perfection by Petitot.

The two methods which were peculiar to the Middle Ages are known as *Cloisonné* and *Champlevé*.

In the *cloisonné* process the design is outlined by delicate partitions of metal soldered on to a metal plate forming the base. In each of these compartments the glass enamel, coloured by means of metallic oxides, is placed in the form of powder. The plate is then fired,

MINIATURES

which fuses the powdered glass into a homogeneous mass. In the *champlevé* process the design is formed by the graving-tool on the metal plaque.

From the Renaissance period 'painted enamels' were much used for decorating vessels and jewellery.

In the fifteenth century there existed a flourishing school at Limoges, which practised the art of 'painted enamels.' The first 'painted enamels' represent religious subjects, and are executed on rather thick copper plates, generally arranged in triptychs, mounted on wooden boards and framed with narrow gilded copper mouldings, joined with hinges. The design is indicated by lines engraved on the copper and covered with dark brown enamel; these lines sufficed to retain the different enamels and prevent them from running. The colouring is rather violent; the draperies, which are arranged in large folds, brightened by gold lines, are blue, violet, or green, and often crude in tone. The flesh-tints, almost always purplish or bistre, are modelled with touches of opaque white, which, when not laid on very thickly, allows of the under layer of enamel being seen through it.

Amongst the few names of enamellers of this period which have come down to us, the family of Penicaud have furnished the most excellent examples of the Limousin school. Nardon Penicaud was the first of this family, and was probably born about 1470. He executed chiefly religious subjects, of which specimens are found in almost all large collections. It must, however, be remembered that in all probability he had a studio in which numerous craftsmen worked, and that there were many enamellers working at Limoges at that time, producing work of the same kind. The principal characteristics of this school were the pinkness of the flesh-tints, the vigour of the drawing, and the numerous touches of gold added with the brush.

There were three artists of the same family, named Jean Penicaud, known as the first, second, and third.

THE ART AT LIMOGES

The earliest enamels of Jean I. have many points of resemblance with those of Nardon. Of the work of Jean II. and his pupils, M. Darcel mentions the transparent greys of the figures as a characteristic, obtained by means of a double layer of white enamel. There is a portrait of Luther in the collection of Baron James de Rothschild, produced about 1531, and one of Pope Clement VII. in the Louvre, dated 1534, both of which are by Jean Penicaud II.

Jean III. seems to have been the most accomplished of the family. He rarely copied from engravings, as all his contemporaries did, but was sure enough of himself in most cases to design his own compositions. His figures are almost always very elegant, and the draperies are delicately arranged with many folds. He also painted *en grisaille* on a black ground, and improved the effect with a few touches of gold. Pierre Penicaud seems to have been the last of the name, and is said to have been a pupil of Jean Penicaud III.

Early in the sixteenth century a transformation took place in the methods used, and instead of opaque or translucent enamels of several colours, artists adopted the *grisaille*, to which the school of Limoges has owed its chief glory, and which represents the most characteristic type of Limousin enamelling. In this manner the design is drawn in white on a dark ground.

It was Leonard Limousin, born about 1505 at Limoges, who carried the process of modelling by transparency to the greatest perfection, and added to this process a method by which he was able to obtain more precision, and make beautiful portraits, which he copied from the engravings and drawings of contemporary artists. He prepared the flesh-tints with a rather thick layer of white enamel, and on this layer, after it had been fired, he worked with the brush in pale reddish bistre, using delicate hatchings or stippling to model the faces and indicate the features. The hair and beard were prepared with light yellow or brown enamel, and then drawn

MINIATURES

in with bistre of the same colour but darker in tone. This was in fact the first application of the method which Petitot, with a greater knowledge of the chemistry of colour, and the other painters on enamel of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, employed with so much success.

Limousin was most famous as a painter of portraits, and his portrait of Eleanor of Austria, second wife of François I., in the Museum at Cluny, is one of the first attempts at painting in vitrifiable colours on a white enamel ground.

Enough has been said about these earlier encrusted enamels, and paintings *in* enamel, to show that the miniature enamel, or painting *on* enamel, is essentially a different art, and although the latter method grew out of the former, the conditions of production are such as to completely separate the two arts. The art of enamelling has manifested itself at different epochs under forms absolutely different from one another. The art of the fourteenth century differs absolutely from that of the twelfth, and in like manner the art of the sixteenth does not seem to proceed from one or the other. These different modes of expression have nothing in common except the medium employed. This is in a great measure to be accounted for by the fact that, until the middle of the seventeenth century, enamelling could hardly be considered an independent art, but rather a method of decoration which was intimately allied to the art of the goldsmith. The art, as practised at Limoges, was one in which the artist must be an enameller in the true sense of the word; he was a painter in enamels, and it was one of the drawbacks to his art that he was never sure of success, the firing being so risky that many a masterpiece was transformed into a comparatively worthless production. For a long time the discovery of the method adopted by the miniature enamellers was attributed to the goldsmith Jean Toutin, but we have seen

JEAN PETITOT—PIERRE BORDIER

that Leonard Limousin painted the heads and hands of his portraits by means of hatchings and stippling in a reddish bistre on white enamel, and so had foreshadowed the direction of development in the subsequent art of the seventeenth century.

Jean Toutin may at least be credited with having revived this process and developed it to greater perfection. He started by decorating with enamel various jewels of his own making; then, with the aid of his son Henry Toutin, and a painter in pastel, Isaac Gribelin, he soon became an accomplished painter of small enamel portraits. He had pupils and imitators, and amongst others Dubié, Morlière of Orleans, Robert Vauquer of Blois, and Pierre Chartier, also of Blois, who distinguished himself especially in the painting of flowers.

But the most celebrated artist in this kind of painting was Jean Petitot, who was born at Geneva in 1607. It was here that the art of enamelling watch-cases, snuff-boxes, and jewels was brought to great technical perfection, although poor in design. Petitot's father was an artist of merit who, after distinguishing himself in Rome as an architect and sculptor in wood, had sacrificed his career by coming to Geneva in 1597, in order to practise his religion undisturbed, within the pale of Protestantism. The son of the sculptor found in the goldsmith's trade of Geneva the hope of lucrative employment and a means of gratifying the artistic tastes which he had inherited. He devoted himself with success to the ornamentation and enamelling of jewels, under the direction of a Geneva goldsmith, Pierre Bordier. Their methods consisted merely in engraving and colouring flowers, foliage, etc., on the metal, and the science of chemistry, of which little was known, was not of much assistance to them. Petitot's artistic aspirations made him dissatisfied with the productions of the Geneva industry, and the two friends determined to travel and study new methods in foreign laboratories.

They went to Italy and France, where Petitot is said

MINIATURES

to have worked for the Toutins, famous goldsmiths of Châteaudun and Blois. Finally they came to England, in the reign of Charles I., whose discriminating tastes and fondness for all works of art are well known. On his arrival in London, Petitot immediately offered his services to the king's goldsmith, and soon supplied him with rings and other jewels, ornamented with so much delicacy and brilliancy that when they were presented to the king he desired to see the craftsman who had made them. This was the great opportunity of Petitot's life, and ultimately led to the invaluable assistance of the king's doctor, Sir Theodore Turquet de Mayence, in discovering new colours, especially flesh-tints, which were lacking, and also the co-operation of the king's favourite artist, Sir Antony Vandyck. Their united efforts produced the exquisite results which have made the name of Petitot so famous. The counsels of Vandyck enabled Petitot to acquire great dexterity in painting portraits, and the discoveries of the physician resulted in the production of colours, the long-felt want of which had been the cause of a certain coarseness in the enamels of Limoges and Blois. For a long time Petitot lived at Whitehall, working exclusively for Charles I. He painted portraits of the king and principal personages of the court, from paintings by Vandyck, which in the small space of a few inches reproduced all the details and much of the feeling of the larger pictures, and had the advantage of being imperishable.

On the death of Charles I. in 1649, Petitot left England for good, and with many other English Royalists went to Paris. His collaborator, Pierre Bordier, remained in London, untroubled by political scruples, and executed enamelled jewels for the Parliament. The only enamel which can be attributed with certainty to the hand of Bordier is the Fairfax jewel, which was made in 1645 to commemorate the Parliament's victory at Naseby. It consists of two circular plates, about $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches in diameter, which were mounted with fine diamonds, to form the



LA COMTESSE DE GRIGNAN
DAUGHTER OF MADAME DE SÉVIGNÉ
BY JEAN PETITOT

GIULIO, CARDINAL MAZARIN
BY JEAN PETITOT

HENRIETTE, DUCHESSE D'ORLEANS
DAUGHTER OF KING CHARLES I
BY JEAN PETITOT

LA MARQUISE DE SÉVIGNÉ
BY JEAN PETITOT

ANNE (NINON) DE L'ENCLOS
BEAUTY OF TIME OF LOUIS XV
BY JEAN PETITOT

PETITOT'S PORTRAITS

case of a watch, and it cost the Government £700. Walpole, in whose possession it was, speaks of this jewel in the most extravagant terms. He says, referring to one of the plates, 'Nothing can be more perfect than the diminutive figures; of many even the countenances are distinguishable. On the other piece, within, is delineated the battle of Naseby; on the outside is Fairfax himself on his chestnut horse, men engaging at a distance. The figure and horse are copied from Vandyck, but with a freedom and richness of colouring, perhaps surpassing that great master.' It is signed 'P. Bordier, fecit.'

It was not long after Petitot's arrival in Paris that Louis XIV. granted him a pension and a lodging in the Louvre, where he was patronised by all the princes and peers in Paris, and the fashion for his enamel portraits continued for nearly half a century. About 1685 Petitot seems to have suffered some persecution on account of his Protestantism, Louis sending him to prison at Fort-l'Évêque. He, however, remained faithful to his religious opinions, and it was only when he became ill with fever that he obtained his release. He immediately escaped to Geneva, where he was so overwhelmed with patronage that he was obliged to retire to Vevey, and was soon after attacked by a sudden illness, and died at the age of eighty-four.

In his earlier works Petitot painted skies and landscapes of delicate execution, if a little hard, into the backgrounds of his portraits, but this habit he renounced afterwards, probably under the advice of Vandyck. He painted a great number of portraits of Louis XIV., which were mounted by the court jewellers in various ways, and intended for diplomatic presents. Although the Louvre possesses a remarkable collection of his works, it is in England that the finest are to be found. There are two hundred and fifty at Windsor Castle, and the Jones collection at South Kensington comprises seventy-two.

Space alone prevents me from giving more than a few examples of his work as illustrations, namely

MINIATURES

Marie Angélique de Scoraille de Roussille, Duchesse de Fantanges (1661-1681), and Françoise Louise de la Baume de Blanc, Duchesse de la Vallière (Plate xLI.), also five from the Jones collection (Plate xxxix.).

I give a reproduction from a very charming miniature of that remarkable woman, Ninon de L'Enclos (Plate xL.). It is similar to several enamels by Petitot, but is more graceful in pose and contour, and has in addition the hand raised to the breast.

It will be remembered that Ninon de L'Enclos was a celebrated beauty of the time of Louis xv., and the daughter of a gentleman of Touraine. The prodigal child of an epicurean age of indulgence, she preferred the liberty and freedom of Bohemianism to marriage. Mistress of herself at the age of fifteen, and rich enough to be independent, Ninon sacrificed the life of Versailles to be queen of her own little court in the Rue de Tournelles in the Marais, which she had made a school of good taste, and where she reigned until over eighty years of age, always beautiful, witty, generous, and devoted to her friends.

There is no lack of opportunity in England of studying Petitot's prolific genius, whether it be his almost numberless array of gem portraits of the fair women and gay gallants of the courts of 'Le Grand Monarque' and our own unfortunate Charles, or those delicate and personal trinkets, the *boîtes à portraits*, adorned with such peculiarly French grace. At Hertford House we may see some exquisite examples, at Kensington there are many more which aid our imaginations in peopling this fine world. All private collections of any importance possess specimens attributed to Petitot, not to mention the numerous foreign collections, until we are forced to the conclusion that Jacques and Pierre Bordier, his friends and assistants, Jean Petitot, his son, and his many disciples, must have been responsible for a fair number of them. Jacques Bordier is supposed to have painted only the hair, costumes, and backgrounds,

PORTRAIT OF PETITOT

whilst Petitot painted the faces, but such a partnership was probably very elastic; and it is quite certain the son produced enamels which, but for the date and age of the personages represented, might pass for the work of the father. The Earl of Dartrey possesses a portrait of the elder Petitot painted by himself, one of the younger having the inscription, 'Petitot, painted by himself at the age of thirty-three, 1685,' and also one by the latter of his wife Madeline Bordier. There are few of the collaborated portraits by Bordier and Petitot known to exist, for the reason that there is rarely to be found either signature, date, or other mark upon them. This is certainly the case with all those at the Louvre.

Richelet's famous *Dictionnaire François*, published about 1680, gives us an interesting side-light on the art. It tells us that 'a portrait in enamel of the size of the palm of one's hand costs forty or fifty pistoles, when it is by a clever painter, and the smaller ones fifteen and twenty pistoles. Painting in enamel is done on plates of gold or copper, enamelled in white by the goldsmith, and the colours are then laid on with a brush. The colours of the painter in enamel are black, azure, grey, red, purple, etc. But it is necessary to bake enamels in order to fuse the colours on the plate, and for that purpose they should be fired seven or eight times.' Mariette, a learned authority, says, 'The finest picture ever painted in enamel is the portrait of Cardinal Mazarin by Petitot.' This belonged to the Abbot of Breteuil, and we have also one of this cardinal in the Jones collection (Plate xxxix.), and it is worthy of remark that there are quite a number of instances of duplicates or similar portraits existing of the same person. The Petitots, and indeed all the enamellers, produced their enamels from the originals of other famous painters more often than from their own studies. The most usual size of a Petitot enamel is between one and two inches, but there are famous examples of larger dimensions. Vertue and Walpole speak of the portrait of the Duchess of Southampton,

MINIATURES

Rachel de Ruvigny, which is nearly ten inches in height, as 'the best production in enamel in the world.' There should be also mentioned the large one preserved in the Museum at Geneva, reproducing Lebrun's picture, 'The Family of Darius at the Feet of Alexander.' The former is said to be the largest portrait that Petitot produced, and now belongs to the Duke of Devonshire. Unfortunately it has been injured, but the same collection contains the famous one of the Duke of Portland, mentioned by Walpole. Lord Rosebery exhibited at the Burlington Fine Arts Club in 1889 two magnificent full-length portraits, in water-colour, of Louis XIV. and Marie Thérèse, his wife, signed J. Petitot, and Dr. Propert showed his Duchess of Portsmouth, another signed example by Jean Louis, the son.

Petitot the elder and Jacques Bordier married two sisters; the former was forty-five years of age at the time. It is fair to suppose that this Jacques, as some authorities state, was a younger relation of the Bordier with whom Petitot had worked in England. These sisters were Marguerite and Madeline Cuper, and Petitot had seventeen children by his wife Marguerite, nine sons and eight daughters, the only one of the sons following his father's profession being Jean Louis. He was born in 1652; at sixteen he was painting enamels, and at twenty-five he came to England and was received with favour by Charles II. It is also said that he studied under Samuel Cooper. His work, as a rule, lacks his father's purity of colour, though many of his enamels are little less brilliant, and are marked by the same beautiful surface. Jean Louis divided his time between Paris and England, the date of his death being uncertain.

Petitot had several pupils, and amongst them was Louis de Châtillon, who was born at Sainte-Menehould in 1639, and died in 1734. He painted portraits of Louis XIV. as gifts to foreign ambassadors. There is every probability that many of the enamels attributed to Petitot were by the hand of Châtillon, as, although the latter

LOUIS DE CHÂTILLON

must have painted an enormous number, very few are supposed to exist. There are, however, the two large water-colour miniatures at Montagu House by him, which I have previously mentioned. He had as a pupil Jean Baptiste Massé, born in 1688. Appointed painter to King Louis xv., and then member of the Académie in 1717, Massé soon became one of the most fashionable portrait miniature painters of the day. There are very few portraits on enamel by him, and he seems to have worked chiefly in water-colour and miniature. The Duke of Buccleuch possesses one or two charming examples of Massé's work in water-colour. The one which represents Madame Henrietta of France, three-quarter length, seated, is beautiful in form and colour, and is certainly the best miniature I have seen by this artist.

Amongst other enamellers of the end of the seventeenth century, belonging to the school of Petitot, was Jacques Philippe Ferrand, born in 1653, son of Louis Ferrand, physician to Louis XIII. He studied drawing at the studio of Mignard, and afterwards became the pupil of Samuel Bernard, the clever miniaturist. Later on he worked at enamelling, and won a great reputation in this style of painting. He was made a member of the Académie in 1690, and died in Paris in 1732.

Elizabeth Sophie Chéron, a lady artist of great talent, distinguished herself in the painting of miniatures on enamel and in water-colour. Born in 1648, she died in 1711. She had been made a member of the Academy of Painting in 1672, and also received a pension from the king.

Jacques Antoine Arlaud, the Genevese, has already been mentioned as a miniaturist who came to England and painted members of the royal family. His principal reputation, however, was made in Paris by his paintings on enamel.

Jean Frederic Bruckmann, a Swede, worked at Paris in the eighteenth century, and painted innumerable enamels of the king, some of which are spoken of as

MINIATURES

'portraits émaillés en bas-relief,' and twice over he supplied nineteen portraits of the king in this method, so that it is hardly surprising that portraits of Louis xiv. are so often met with. Mention may also be made of the family of Du Guernier, as workers on enamel, and also famous for the beautiful fans of the Louis xiv. period.

During the first years of the reign of Louis xv., who came to the throne in 1715, there appears to have been a general neglect of the art of painting on enamel, but towards the middle of the eighteenth century it again revived. Its principal exponents about this time in France were Jean Baptiste Massé, Louis François Aubert, and Jean Étienne Liotard. The latter was born at Geneva in 1702, and died in 1779. He has been already cited as one of those artists who visited England during the decadent period of the art of miniature in this country.

There is little doubt that Liotard has had scant justice done him by English authors. Even Dr. Propert, whose judgment is always sane, speaks too slightly of his abilities in saying, 'His works are literally true to nature, but stiff and wanting in ease and grace. He had no power of idealising, or even refining any portrait he undertook. Devoid of imagination, he appeared incapable of rendering anything but what he saw before his eyes, and yet he was an artist of great merit.' The last phrase, taken in its fullest sense, is absolutely true, and because of its truth, the vigour, realism, and selection displayed in his studies from nature make them always interesting and individual. Liotard had great fertility, and we must study examples of his several methods in order to gauge his true worth as an artist. It is not by seeing a few enamels or miniatures that we can arrive at a just estimate of his ability; we must know his etchings, pastels, and even his oil paintings, of which a few exist.

Walpole, speaking of Liotard's visit to England, said: 'Liotard, the painter, has arrived, and has brought me



LADY MARY WORTLEY MONTAGUE

(Enamel)

BY JOHN STEPHEN LIOTARD (?)

NINON DE L'ENCLOS

(DOUBTFUL)

JEAN ÉTIENNE LIOTARD

the portrait of Marivaux, which gives a very different idea than one would imagine of the author of *Marianne*. The resemblance is said to be perfect.' Amongst the English notables who sat to Liotard, we know that Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, the authoress and poetess, was one, and the beautiful enamel which I am enabled to give as an illustration (Plate XL.), and which is framed in an exquisite gold filigree frame, I believe to be by this artist.

In 1770 Marie Thérèse wrote to Marie Antoinette: 'I hope they will send me a good portrait, and especially by the hand of Liotard, who is going express to Paris in order to send it to me. I pray you to give him the time to do it well.' And a month later: 'I am awaiting the picture by Liotard with great impatience, but in your proper attire, not in *négligé*, nor in man's dress, loving to see you in the place that belongs to you.' When this portrait did finally arrive, as is so often the case, imagination had coloured reality, and Liotard 'hardly succeeded' in pleasing the royal mother with the likeness. Nevertheless he retained the good graces of Her Majesty.

Jean Adam Mathieu was born about 1698, and was an artist of talent, who chiefly devoted himself to enamelling snuff-boxes and jewels. He was lodged at the Louvre and appointed painter to the king in 1753, but died the same year.

André Rouquet, like so many other enamellers, a native of Geneva, succeeded the former artist in his lodging at the Louvre. Although a Protestant, he was made, by order of Louis xv., a member of the Académie Royale of Painting in 1754, and, as we have seen in a previous chapter, he came to England and followed in the footsteps of Frederic Zincke. Lafont de Saint-Jeune said of him: 'I owe a tribute of praise to Rouquet, painter on enamels. The beauty of the portraits by him which appeared at the Salon of 1753 give promise that he will replace the celebrated Petitot, called the "Raphael of enamellers."'

MINIATURES

Charles Boit and Frederic Zincke, although themselves foreigners, worked almost exclusively in England, and represent the beginning of the English school of painters on enamel in the reign of George I. The first-named was born at Stockholm in 1663, and came to England to follow his trade as a jeweller, but he soon took to painting enamel portraits. It is said that at first he had so little success that he went about the country teaching children to draw.

However, Boit soon succeeded, with the help of recommendations from the painter Dahl, in gaining a reputation as a painter of enamel portraits. Walpole throws doubt on the enormous prices that Boit is reputed to have received for his enamels, though he gives credit to the fact of £500 being paid for some of the larger plates. The greatest work that Boit attempted was unfortunately not finished. It was an enamel, measuring 24 inches by 18, and represented Queen Anne surrounded by her court, with the figure of Victory introducing the Duke of Marlborough and Prince Eugène. Laguerre painted the design for it in oil. To undertake this work, which was of an exceptional size, Boit obtained an advance of £1000. With this he erected a special furnace in Mayfair, and built workrooms adjoining. The great difficulty was to obtain sufficient heat to lay a 'perfect ground' of white enamel on so large a plate, and it was necessary that the process should be completed in a few hours. Boit does not seem ever to have succeeded in getting an even ground, though he wasted a great deal of money and time in his endeavours. The painting was commenced notwithstanding, but a series of misfortunes prevented its completion. Prince George of Denmark, who had taken exceptional interest in the artist's undertaking, died; their Graces of Marlborough fell out of favour at the court, and were to be displaced from the great work, the Queen ordering Boit to introduce Peace and Lord Ormond instead of Victory and Lord Churchill. Then Prince Eugène refused to sit, and Queen Anne died a little later,

CHARLES BOIT—FREDERIC ZINCKE

before much progress had been made. Boit afterwards appears to have fallen into financial difficulties, and to have fled to France, where the regent received him with favour, giving him a pension of £250 and rooms in the Louvre.

The principal enamel existing by Boit measures 18 inches by 12, and is on gold. It represents the Imperial family of Austria, and is preserved at Vienna. At Montagu House there are some good examples of his smaller portrait enamels. One of Admiral Churchill is very fine in the colour of the flesh, and the dark wig, purple coat, white stock, and greyish-brown background produce a very pleasing harmony.

Frederic Zincke was the pupil of Boit. He was born at Dresden in 1684, and came to England in 1706. Walpole goes so far as to say that he not only surpassed Boit, but rivalled Petitot. In speaking of a head of Cowley, by Zincke, after Sir Peter Lely, Walpole says: 'The impassioned glow of sentiment, the eyes swimming with truth and tenderness, and the natural fall of the long ringlets that flow round the unbuttoned collar, are rendered with the most exquisite nature, and finished with elaborate care.' This miniature is now in the possession of Mr. R. S. Holford. The numerous examples which exist in the various collections in England justify this admiration. The flesh-colour in many of the miniature enamels by Zincke is far more delicate, pure, and truthful than that of contemporary artists. I have selected for illustration an enamel portrait of a lady (Plate XLI.). It is particularly delicate in its flesh-tints, the pink and white draperies and grey background. This is altogether a most charming miniature on enamel, and is quite free from any suspicion of coarseness in the colour tones or the drawing. We see here none of the tendency to purplish half-tones or brick-red carnations, which is so prevalent in the work of others, but the entire enamel is of a pearly brilliancy which is quite captivating.

The work of Zincke is far in advance of that of his

MINIATURES

master, and, in fact, I am inclined to agree with Walpole in his assertion that he rivalled Petitot in some of his qualities. The wonderful glaze, which has been so often praised in the earlier master, is without doubt absent from the later one; but there are often qualities of delicacy and brilliancy in the flesh-colour of Zincke that we do not find in Petitot.

Zincke's enamels were in great demand, and he was patronised by all the notable people of the time. George III. and his queen were among these distinguished patrons, and the Prince of Wales appointed him his cabinet painter. There is no doubt, from the evidence supplied us by Horace Walpole, that Zincke was obliged to increase his terms for a portrait from twenty to thirty guineas, in order to reduce the number of his sitters.

As we have seen, all the enamellers who practised their art in this country were of foreign birth, and although some of them made England their home and practised their art here, to their own and our considerable advantage, we have to admit that in this branch of miniature painting we are quite outshone by continental artists. The lack of native talent at this time, as we have noted, was not confined to this branch of art, but was general throughout the whole field of the fine arts, and it is not until the early days of George III.'s reign that we find amongst the band of greater painters who are mainly responsible for the vigorous revival, the names of really worthy English miniaturists and painters on enamel.

Jean Baptiste Weyler was a native of Strasbourg, but worked and made his reputation at Paris, where he was made an Academician. The portrait which won him his inception was of the Count d'Augivillier, and is now in the Museum of the Louvre. He had commenced a series of portraits of great men on enamel, and his widow, Louise Bourdon, continued the series after his death, but they are very inferior to those by Weyler.

F. Bourgoïn painted on enamel during the eighteenth century, and received high prices for his portraits of

COURTOIS—THOURON—HALL

Louis xv. He was a professor of the Academy of Saint Luke.

L. Durand was a clever painter on enamel, who was under the special patronage of the Duc d'Orleans, and also worked for Louis xv., supplying the Minister of Foreign Affairs with many enamels of the king for the usual diplomatic snuff-boxes.

Nicholas André Courtois was one of the most notable enamellers in Louis xvi.'s reign. He was made a member of the Académie, was much employed by the French court, and won considerable success by the portraits he exhibited at the Salon.

Jacques Thouron, a Genevese, became well known in his native country, and still more so in Paris, for his miniatures on enamel. One of his contemporaries says of him, 'He knows how to give to this kind of painting the warmth and life which have hitherto only been produced in oils.'

But of all the artists in miniature who made their reputations in Paris, Pierre Adolphe Hall has by far the greatest celebrity. His talents were not confined to miniature, for he worked in oil and pastel. Born in Sweden, he came to Paris about 1760, and at once took the first place as a miniaturist. He painted many enamels for ornaments and boxes, some of which were set in diamonds. One of the Dauphin, afterwards Louis xvi., is specially mentioned, as having been sent to Marie Antoinette on her arrival at Strasbourg in 1770. For this portrait Hall was paid 2664 francs, and the box in which it was mounted, surrounded by seventy-five brilliants, cost 78,678 francs. The Comte de Provence was one of his patrons, and a portrait of him by Hall, painted for the count's affianced bride, the Princess of Savoy, was set in a bracelet surrounded by sixteen large diamonds, at a cost of 15,552 francs. Hall's knowledge of chemistry and physics helped him in perfecting the colours he used for painting on enamel, which, it is said, he practised with even more delight than miniature painting. His enamels

MINIATURES

were very much appreciated, and he considered them superior to his water-colour miniatures, but, strange as it may appear, M. Villot, who has written a most excellent biography of this artist, tells us that not only do his family possess none, but after twenty years of research the writer had not been able to meet with one of which the authenticity was undoubted. It is, however, stated by a writer signing himself R. H. S. S., that there exists an enamel miniature belonging to M. Gaston Le Breton of Rouen, signed on the front by Hall, and dated on the back, which has been recognised by M. Villot as of great interest.

Jean Baptiste Jacques Augustin became chief miniaturist and painter on enamel to Louis XVIII. His best portraits on enamel are those of Napoleon I., Josephine, Louis XVIII., and especially his own portrait painted by himself in 1809, which is now at the Louvre.

When we come to consider the English artists who painted on enamel, we find there are very few names of note. Gervase Spencer was the first miniaturist who produced portraits on enamel in the first half of the eighteenth century. He died in 1763. His pictures on enamel possessed many good qualities, and there are a fair number of them in existing collections. I am able to give a very good example from the Duke of Buccleuch's collection (Plate XLI.). It is a portrait of Admiral Byng, who was tried and shot in George III.'s reign for failing to retake the island of Minorca, and for the defence of whom the great Pitt resigned office. This is a signed example of Spencer's work on enamel, and though an excellent miniature it has a tendency—very prevalent in miniatures on enamel—to be too pink in the flesh-tints. This is not the case with the enamel of the Countess of Coventry—illustrated on the same plate—which is refined in colour and in drawing.

The next three English miniaturists who painted on enamel all have the distinction of being foundation members of the Royal Academy of Arts. They are Michael Moser, Jeremiah Meyer, and Nathaniel Hone.



Admiral Bugey.
BY GERVASE SPENCER.

Duchesse de la Vallière.
BY PETITOT.

A Lady.
BY F. ZINCKE.

Countess of Coventry.
BY GERVASE SPENCER.

Madlle. Fontanges.
BY PETITOT.

ENAMELS.

Boucher.
BY BERNET.

Handel (IN A RING)
BY F. ZINCKE.

Horace Walpole.
BY W. PREWETT.

MOSER—MEYER—HONE—PREWITT

Michael Moser, like so many other brothers of the brush, at first worked as a jeweller, but he possessed a talent which was greatly in excess of the requirements of this craft. He distinguished himself as a painter, sculptor, and medallist, and, amongst other works, produced the Great Seal of England. Examples of his work are very scarce.

Jeremiah Meyer was of German nationality, having been born at Tübingen, in Wurtemberg, in 1735, but he came to England at the age of fourteen and was the pupil of Zincke. He was naturalised, and afterwards appointed painter to the queen and enameller to George III. Meyer was undoubtedly one of the numerous artists who took Sir Joshua Reynolds as a model, and we can see reflected in his work some of the President's gift for colour, and a little of his graceful refinement. His enamels, like his miniatures, are quite excellent in their qualities, and, as Dr. Propert has said, 'remind one of the beautiful work of John Smart.'

Nathaniel Hone was an Irishman, born at Dublin in 1718. He distinguished himself by being a very turbulent member of the Royal Academy. He first essayed to surpass his great contemporary, Sir Joshua Reynolds, in the painting of oil portraits, but, failing in this ambitious task, he lost no opportunity of satirising him. He worked in water-colours as well as on enamel, and died in 1784.

Horace Hone was the son of Nathaniel, and elected an Associate of the Academy, but did not equal his father. He died in 1825, aged sixty-nine.

William Prewitt was another pupil of Zincke, and possesses many of the qualities of his master. His colour is pure and brilliant, and his drawing good and delicate. I give an interesting illustration from an enamel miniature of Horace Walpole when young; it is a very excellent example and good in colour. Walpole is here represented at the age of eighteen, and wears a blue coat, red waistcoat, and white stock.

MINIATURES

We next have Samuel Finney, who came to London to study law, but quitted that profession for miniature painting. In 1765 he was appointed 'enamel and miniature painter' to Queen Charlotte. By his profession he amassed sufficient fortune to pay off the encumbrances on his family estates, and finally retired to Fulshaw, where he became a Justice of the Peace, and devoted the remainder of his life to quelling the riots in Cheshire and in local improvements.

Of all the enamellers who practised their art in this country in the eighteenth century, Henry Bone undoubtedly stands highest. He was a native of Cornwall, and was born at Truro in 1755. The first stages of his art were learned as an apprentice to a manufacturer of china at Plymouth, where he commenced working at the age of sixteen. Subsequently the factory was removed to Bristol, and Bone was employed by the new proprietors to ornament porcelain with landscapes and flowers. At the age of twenty-four he removed to London, and for some time found employment as a device-painter for watch-cases, buttons, brooches, and other knick-knacks. It was the failing of the fashion for these ornamented trifles that first stirred Bone to think seriously of carrying the art of painting on enamel far beyond the limits to which it had hitherto been confined. It was his ambition to produce larger and more perfect enamels. He endeavoured to simplify the colours then in use, and to reduce the number to as few as possible, at the same time making them of a uniform consistency as to fusion, expansion, and contraction. In his methods of painting he was also opposed to the prevalent idea that it was necessary to mix every tint intended to be used, but tried rather to apply the same principles that obtained in other species of painting, and combine the simple primary colours so as to produce the harmony, richness, and power attained by painters in oil. That he achieved his ambition many of his contemporaries testified in his own day, and the permanent brilliancy of his works are eloquent proof of it to-day.



THE COUNTESS OF DYSART

(Enamel)

BY HENRY BONE, AFTER SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS

HENRY BONE

The first attempt of the artist in an enamel portrait was a picture of his wife, which, on being exhibited at the Academy in 1780, attracted notice from its unusual size. It was only $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches, but then the ordinary enamel portrait was never larger than a half-crown. This was followed by a picture of a 'Muse and Cupid,' measuring $5\frac{1}{4}$ inches by $4\frac{1}{4}$. A portrait of Lord Eglinton attracted the notice of the Prince of Wales, and led to many commissions, and in 1800 Bone was appointed enamel painter to His Royal Highness. Previous to this he had exhibited an enamel after Sir Joshua Reynolds's 'Sleeping Beauty,' which brought him into general notice. Bone's reputation rose with great rapidity; he succeeded in adding considerable prestige to the art, and in lifting it out of the confined limits of the merely ornamental. The art of portraiture on enamel is considered to be essentially the art of copying, and not one in which the painter can produce the 'first intentioned' effect of an original. It is, perhaps, yet to be proved that a portrait can be painted direct from life on enamel with entirely satisfactory results. As a copyist on enamel, Henry Bone is pre-eminent, as the great series of famous and illustrious persons at the court of Elizabeth shows. This series comprises eighty-five portraits, which were painted from the original pictures in the royal and other collections. They all remained in the artist's possession until his death, when they were disposed of by public sale in 1856, the greater number being purchased by Mr. W. J. Bankes, after having been previously offered to the Government for £5000. The largest enamel that Bone ever executed was a copy of Titian's 'Bacchus and Ariadne,' which measured 18 inches by 16, and for which he received from Mr. George Bowles the sum of 2200 guineas. The success of this enamel was made possible, because about this time Bone was instructed by a friend how to prepare the plate himself. I believe the largest enamel picture that has ever been successfully finished is a copy of a holy family after Parmigiano, which is to be

MINIATURES

seen at Buckingham Palace, and, as the editor of Walpole's *Anecdotes* tells us, was prepared for Mr. Muss by Alfred Essex.

The set of Royalist portraits of the time of Charles I., which Henry Bone commenced, was not completed at his death, but was continued by his son, Henry Pierce Bone. Pierce Bone was the pupil of his father, but commenced by exhibiting portraits in oil. He finally turned his attention to enamels, and was appointed enamel painter to Queen Adelaide, Queen Victoria, and the Prince Consort, dying in 1855.

Henry Bone, the father, was elected an Associate of the Royal Academy in 1801, and appointed painter in enamel to George III., George IV., and William IV. In 1811 he was made a full R.A., and died in 1834.

I am very fortunate in being able to give a reproduction from the famous Countess of Dysart enamel, by Bone the elder, which attracted so much attention at the Burlington Fine Arts Club Exhibition in 1889 (Plate XLII.). Though of necessity the limitations of the colour process make it difficult to do full justice to the magnificence of the original, the reader may obtain a very fair idea of it. Without doubt it surpasses any other rendering in enamel of a portrait by Sir Joshua Reynolds. Its excellence may be said to lift it above the level of mere craftsmanship, and, as Dr. Propert has said, 'is sufficient to fill us with vain regrets that Reynolds was not an enameller.'

There are one or two other less important names which are associated with this branch of the art. Henry Spicer was one of the best enamellers belonging to the staff of artists appointed to the Prince of Wales. He was born in Norfolk, and became a pupil of Gervase Spencer, and executed a considerable number of portraits, exhibiting constantly at the Incorporated Society and Royal Academy. He also visited Dublin, and painted many Irish notables. He died in London in 1804.

Richard Collins was a pupil of Jeremiah Meyer, and

JOHN PLOTT—WILLIAM ESSEX

was appointed principal enamel painter to George III. He was a native of Hampshire, and was born in 1755, dying in London in 1831.

Samuel Cotes, the younger brother of Francis Cotes, R.A., was brought up in the profession of his father, who was an apothecary in Cook Street, Burlington Gardens. Stimulated by his brother's success, and loving the arts, he took to miniature painting. He produced some very good enamels, and also worked in crayon and water-colours. He died in 1818.

Then we have John Plott, who was another of those who started life in an employment which proved uncongenial, and who took to art as a pleasanter alternative. He commenced as an attorney's clerk, then became a pupil of Richard Wilson, the landscape painter, and finally discovered that his bent was towards portraiture. He worked under Nathaniel Hone in miniature and enamel, in which he seems to have been successful, frequently exhibiting at the Royal Academy. He died at Stoke, near Winchester, in 1803, where he had been born in 1732.

Finally, I must mention William Essex, who rightly belongs to the nineteenth century. He had thoroughly studied the chemistry of colour, and wrote a treatise on the art of enamelling. Essex was essentially a copyist of landscape and figure subjects, by old and modern masters. He first exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1818, and was appointed miniature painter to Queen Victoria in 1839, and he died at the advanced age of eighty-five.

APPENDIX

COLLECTIONS AND COLLECTORS

OUR national collections are quite inadequate to give us an idea of the real worth of this delicate English art. The little that exists has been mainly bequeathed by private donors, and in the two principal instances the collections are chiefly representative of foreign schools. At Hertford House we have a very interesting, and in some respects a distinguished, collection of French miniatures, with only a very few English masters most inharmoniously, though instructively, distributed amongst them. At the Victoria and Albert Museum there is the Jones collection of enamels and miniatures, with again a few English paintings sprinkled here and there in the cases, and to be discovered they have to be carefully looked for. There are some good Coopers, and a few by some of his contemporaries put away in a room devoted to the Dyce collection, and there are one or two cases containing an insignificant number of fairly representative examples of later eighteenth and nineteenth century miniaturists, such as Cosway, Humphry, Smart, Engleheart, Robertson, Ross, Newton, and less known painters. This pretty well exhausts our public endeavours at obtaining a worthy monument of the centuries of English artists who have left such superb records of their skill in producing miniature likenesses of our most distinguished forefathers. Other nations than our own would be justly proud of these records of a national art; they would have collected, catalogued, and cared for every worthy specimen that could have been secured. We have practically been content to ignore their existence, and except for individual good

MINIATURES

taste and fitful moods of personal generosity, we should possess no evidence at all of the existence of our art of miniature. We have not the excuse of expense or lack of space, for until recently the finest examples of the best masters could have been bought for very moderate sums, and one good-sized gallery would contain every miniature worthy of notice.

What public enterprise has lacked, private taste has magnificently supplied. To go no further back than the time of Henry VIII., we find that the inventory of his pictures at Westminster contains one hundred and seventy examples, of which sixty-two were portraits, many of these being miniatures. Queen Elizabeth and her court encouraged contemporary miniaturists to a large extent; Charles I. we know enlarged the royal galleries with prodigal munificence, and especially patronised the English painters of small portraits. Even the great Puritan, with all his reputed iconoclastic propensities, was entirely English in his appreciation of the art of portraiture, and supported painters 'in little' by frequent personal sittings. Later, during the eighteenth century renaissance of the art, George III. and George IV. greatly encouraged the fashion. The beneficial influence of the example set by the royal heads of our constitution may be seen in the collections belonging to the King and to our noblemen's ancestral homes, and it is to these we have to turn to-day if we wish to study the art in its entirety.

At the head of the permanent private collections we must certainly place the royal collection at Windsor, with its almost complete line of the kings and queens of England from the time of Henry VIII. to the present day, illustrated by authentic portraits by the greatest miniaturists. This collection as it now exists owes its preservation, as Mr. Richard Holmes tells us, to the wisdom of the late Prince Consort and Queen Victoria, who collected these historical treasures, scattered about the walls of the different palaces, and brought them together. They are now arranged in drawers of a cabinet in the

APPENDIX

royal library, free from the pernicious effects of light and dust. As we have seen, the successive sovereigns have always been the most prominent patrons of the miniaturists from the earliest times, and the examples at Windsor are an interesting and valuable series which bear testimony to this, for, with few exceptions, they are royal heirlooms bequeathed by those for whom the originals were painted. There is no doubt that many of the early miniatures owned by Charles I. and mentioned in his catalogue were dispersed by order of the Commonwealth, and amongst them interesting specimens by our first English miniaturist, Nicholas Hilliard. All the other great English masters are well represented, especially Samuel Cooper, of whose work no collection contains finer examples, though the Duke of Buccleuch possesses a larger number, and the Duke of Portland a few magnificent portraits. The Holbeins and the Isaac Oliver's at Windsor are world-famed, and perhaps the only miniature by the German master which can compare with those in the royal collection is the one recently brought to light by Mr. Holmes, as belonging to the collection of the Queen of Holland. One of the most interesting portraits of the Tudor line is found in the likeness of Lady Jane Grey, which was added to the royal portraits during the late Queen's reign, having originally been the property of Mr. Sackville Bale. Of the Stuart portraits, the one by Janet of Mary Queen of Scots is perhaps the most interesting from a historical point of view, as there is no shadow of doubt concerning its authenticity. It was one of the numerous miniatures belonging to Charles I., and was catalogued by Vander Doort, the keeper of the king's cabinet, and described in every detail. As to its being painted by Janet, he tells us that it was 'supposed to be done by Jennet, a French limmer.'

I have already mentioned elsewhere many of the most interesting miniatures of later dates which have a place in this priceless treasure-house, and I will pass on to the next private collection of importance.

MINIATURES

The Montagu House collection contains many hundred examples, principally representing the painters of the Tudor and Stuart periods, and giving us an array of portraits of kings, queens, princes, prelates, and fair women, together with celebrities in literature, politics, and war. Many of the miniatures originally belonged to Charles I., and others came from the Walpole cabinets. These were brought together by the father of the present Duke of Buccleuch, and arranged under his direction. Hung round the spacious ball-room, drawing-rooms, and private sitting-rooms, they are to be seen to great advantage, more especially as the grouping of the numerous miniatures in each frame has been carried out with more than ordinary judgment and taste. This, it may be said, is a point of most uncommon importance in dealing with a collection of such magnitude. It facilitates reference and enhances the effectiveness of every item, individually and collectively. What strikes the student first in this collection is the magnificent display of Cooper's sober and dignified portraits, and the consummate art with which this painter has contrived to vary his schemes of colour to suit the subject and yet retain his individual simplicity and reticence of tone. From the powerful portrait of Oliver Cromwell to the graceful and dignified little picture of 'La Belle Stuart,' we have a range of character studies which comprises every type and includes most of the famous persons of his day. Each miniature is an eloquent essay on the historical value of truth in portraiture, and at the same time an imaginative and masterly expression of form in an atmosphere of rich and mellow harmonies. We may see here some of the best work of Cooper's contemporaries, John Hoskins, Thomas Flatman, and Nathaniel Dixon, the last-named being represented by some exceptionally good miniatures. The Hoskins miniatures are particularly fine, many of the examples being signed and dated. The earlier masters, Holbein and Hilliard, contribute some very good paintings, as the illustrations in this book show, besides which

APPENDIX

the latter painter contributes three of Queen Elizabeth, a very interesting portrait of himself, one of his father, Richard Hilliard, and others. The Olivers are well represented, and there is a fair selection of enamels by Zincke and Petitot. Amongst the enamels are three rare ones signed by William Prewitt, of Horace Walpole, George Washington, and Nell Gwynne. There are some good miniatures by the early eighteenth century painters Laurence Crosse and Bernard Lens, and the French school shows representative specimens by such artists as Louis de Châtillon, Chasselat, Massé, Aubrey, and Isabey.

The Duke of Portland's miniatures at Welbeck include some very excellent and representative works by most of the old masters of the art. Hilliard's Anne of Denmark and Princess Elizabeth, and Peter Oliver's portrait of himself, are noteworthy. Isaac Oliver's Thomas, Earl of Arundel, Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, and Sir Philip Sidney, are all characteristic. It is in the Samuel Cooper's, however, that we again see the most distinguished portraiture. The John, Earl of Clare, the Colonel Sidney, and the Sir F. Holles are splendid, each in its own way, which is quite different in all three. Thomas Flatman, Bernard Lens, and Laurence Crosse have all found a place here, and the portrait of John Holles of Newcastle is the finest miniature by the last-mentioned painter that I know of. Then we may see charming specimens of the various styles displayed by the rarer foreign miniaturists, such as Arlaud, Richter, Rosalba, together with some of their French contemporaries.

The miniatures belonging to the Duke of Devonshire, though not large in number, contain several interesting items. Amongst the sixteenth and seventeenth century examples we may notice John Hoskins's Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury, and Cooper's profile drawing of Oliver Cromwell in sepia and black, made especially for the engraving by Houbraken; also, by the same artist, a portrait of Elizabeth Claypole. Laurence Crosse shows to some advantage in a portrait of a lady with fair silvery

MINIATURES

hair and ringlets ; it is good both in colour and drawing. The enamellers are noticeable, and include Petitot, Zincke, Bone, Carstairs, and Christian Richter, and there are miniatures by Nicolas Mignard, J. B. Sauvage, and Berse di Riga, who worked at Rome. A few Cosways, and the miniatures after Reynolds by Ozias Humphry, must be mentioned with the works of real interest.

Of other important collections the Earl of Dysart, Earl Wharnccliffe, Earl Beauchamp, the Duke of Norfolk, the Earl of Ilchester, and the Baroness Burdett-Coutts are some of the distinguished owners. In the possession of the last-named there are some of the famous series of Digby portraits, spoken of by Walpole as having been bought 'at great price,' most of the remainder being at Sherborne Castle, all having come from the Strawberry Hill cabinets.

In the Magniac collection at Culworth may be seen an especially good selection of the older masters—the Catherine of Aragon and Henry VIII. by Holbein, from Strawberry Hill, several Hilliards, an oil miniature of Archduke Albert II. of Austria by Sir Antonio More, and, most valuable of all, perhaps, the portraits of the Duc de Guise and Mary Queen of Scots, by François Clouet.

Amongst the smaller collections, those of Major-General Sotheby, Sir Tollemache Sinclair, and Mr. Henry Drake possess peculiar interests of their own. Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Jeffery Whitehead, Mr. E. Joseph, Mr. Ward Usher, Mr. Pierpont Morgan, and Mr. C. H. T. Hawkins are a few more of the well-known connoisseurs who have gathered together many worthy mementoes of an art which I firmly believe will again become of national importance. Mr. Hawkins's collection was sold and dispersed at Christie and Manson's in June of this year, 1904. To have the opportunity of studying the first three principal collections mentioned above is alone sufficient to gain a thorough knowledge of the English art of miniature painting. The many other smaller groups that exist are, as a rule, but echoes of these, though occasionally we

APPENDIX

may find single miniatures that awaken our admiration afresh to some quality that has escaped us, or is less accentuated in the works belonging to the more famous collectors. An instance of this is to be found in the miniature of James, Duke of York, belonging to Major-General Sotheby. It has a completeness, a richness of harmony, a grace of line and force of drawing, combined with depth of tone, which make it an almost unique example of Cooper's art. Another miniature that remains in my memory as a gem of exquisite purity, is Sir Charles Dilke's lovely little Sir Philip Sidney by Isaac Oliver. The delicacy of this little masterpiece, its brilliant and harmonious colouring, and the skilful deftness of the handling, seem to lift it just beyond other miniatures of the same size by this master. It is also greatly enhanced by the beauty of its Bohemian filigree frame, with its intricate detail and soft silvery colour, adding quality and breadth to the jewel it encircles. The same owner has two very excellent miniatures by Peter Oliver, one of Elizabeth of Bohemia, Electress Palatine, and the other Frederick of Bohemia, the Elector. Both are signed, and both were exhibited at the Burlington Fine Arts Club in 1889. All these are in very good preservation, and this leads me to make a few remarks on the care of miniatures. That these remarks are necessary, even at the risk of repeating what has been said before, is obvious, if we have had any experience whatever of the treatment often meted out to these delicate trifles. Let me here say that I believe the old miniatures on card or vellum have really less chance of being damaged by bad treatment than those painted on ivory. Although I have seen numerous early miniatures on card or vellum that have suffered from exposure to light, and have faded, and a few where the solid white used has blackened owing to its preparation with lead, I have never yet come across one that had suffered from cracking or chipping. I do not now speak of manuscript miniatures. In the earlier paintings it was not necessary to mix the colours, nor varnish them, with

MINIATURES

any vehicle of a gummy consistency, though white of egg was sometimes used, especially in laying the ground. The general use of white, or 'body-colour,' caused the painting to dry a uniform flatness without any after-process. Vellum or card have no tendency to split, neither are they affected to any disastrous extent by changes of temperature or dampness, though mildew is by no means an unknown evil. Ivory is much more sensitive to changes of temperature, especially when the sheets are thin. You have only to gently breathe on one side of a piece of ivory, such as is used in the present day for miniatures, to see the rapid way it will curl up towards you. Ivory miniatures are often mounted on thick paper or card, and here lies the danger. The thicker the card, the greater the danger. The paper or card is very absorbent of moisture, and will expand, causing the ivory to curl or crack, more often the latter, as its grain renders it peculiarly lacking in tenacity in one direction. It is far wiser, if mounting is necessary, to use a thin, clear, white notepaper, and then only to use the purest gum-arabic diluted, to stick it to the back of the ivory, placing it in a press between two other sheets of paper until quite dry. This squeezes all superfluous gum out, and leaves between the two surfaces just sufficient only to make them adhere. In framing, a stout piece of ivory, metal or card may be used to back the miniature, which, of course, should first be stuck to the crystal glass by means of gold-beater's skin round the edge. Miniatures mounted in this way will not as a rule suffer from mildew, neither will they curl or crack, and certainly they will never suffer from that irritating abomination, dust beneath the glass. The particularly white crystal used for miniature glasses has a peculiar tendency to sweat, especially in a warm atmosphere. The reason of this I have never heard satisfactorily explained, but certainly miniatures should never be hung over a mantelpiece near a fire, nor should they be hung near a window, both of which facts are as little heeded as they have been often expressed. To those who are used

APPENDIX

to the handling of delicate works of art and have a sensitive touch, it may be of service to know that slight spots of mildew can be quickly removed with a silk handkerchief, and should be thus removed as soon as discovered, before they have had time to affect the painting; also, where the white has blackened, it is best to remove it entirely down to the ivory. To do this, a scraper, such as I have referred to in a previous chapter, should be used. When the ivory is quite free of all colour at the offending spot, it may, if experience is sufficient, be retouched with Chinese white, the spirit of the original touch being retained as far as possible; or if the operator is not sufficiently dexterous to repaint the white, the clean ivory is much less offensive and truer than the original blemishing marks. If the process of unmounting the glass and remounting offers any unaccustomed difficulties, or if the mildew has been allowed to go too far, then it is far better to put the miniature into the hands of an expert—I mean an expert miniaturist, not an expert dealer. I am confident, and this I say with the fullest experience, that owners of valuable works of art can only get the personal attention necessary for such delicate work from a professional miniaturist, whose whole life has been devoted to the especial study of the subject, and whose pride and pleasure it is to achieve the most satisfactory result. When, as sometimes is the case, a portion of the miniature has to be retouched, or even entirely repainted, the knowledge requisite is a great deal more than might be supposed, if the result is to be a complete success. If I am insisting on this point, it is because within my personal knowledge so many owners have had to bring miniatures to the miniaturist after having had them renovated or restored by a so-called expert whose work had to be entirely redone. Old ivory miniatures, notably those painted by Andrew Robertson, Sir William Ross, and their contemporaries, have often had a thick coating of gum or balsam given to them. This in time is almost a certain cause of cracking, principally in the darks, such as

MINIATURES

the coats and dresses where the colour is laid on thickest. These cracks should be carefully watched, and, if inclined to increase, must be attended to by an experienced painter. I might prolong the list of possible contingencies where care and forethought are required, but these few notes must suffice as a warning.

INDEX

	PAGE		PAGE
ABBEY of Scheyren,	26	Anglo-Saxon school, their colour,	
— — — Conrad de Scheyren,		design, and manipulation, . . .	14, 15
prior,	26	— — — miniatures, their attempt	
Academy, the Royal,	156	at beauty in the faces,	15
— — — original members,	156	— — — Alcuin of York,	16
Aidan, Bishop, who brought Celtic		Anguisciola, Sophonisba, sixteenth	
style from Ireland,	12	century Italian miniaturist, . . .	259
Aix-la-Chapelle, the illuminations of,	16	— — — her three sisters,	259
Albemarle, Duke of, George Monk,		Anjou, Duke of, patron,	30, 39
portrait of,	126	— Margaret of, miniature in the	
Alcuin of York, Anglo-Saxon monk,		Shrewsbury book,	39
illuminator,	16	Anne of Bretagne. <i>See</i> Bretagne.	
Aldegrever, Heinrich, illuminator,		Anticone, Johann Baptiste, minia-	
etc.,	45	turist, sixteenth century Italian .	259
Aldenrath, nineteenth century minia-		Aragon, Catherine of, miniatures	
turist of Hamburg,	258	of,	87
Alessandria, Antonio, miniaturist,		Arlaud, Jacques Antoine, eighteenth	
nineteenth century Italian, . . .	261	century miniaturist and enameller,	
— Agazzi, miniaturist, nineteenth		French school,	149, 279
century Italian,	261	— — — his miniatures,	150
Alfred, King, patron,	13	— — — his brother,	150
Alphonso, son of Edward I. (the		Arrangement of miniatures, the, .	296
Tenison Psalter),	24	Art of the Netherlands,	78
Alphonso x., King of Leon and Cas-		— — — its influence on other	
tile, patron,	26	schools,	78
Altdorfer, Albert, illuminator, etc., .	45	Artists, the Free Society of, . . .	156
Althorp, portrait of Henry VIII. at, .	90	— Society of, of Great Britain, .	156
Amalteo, Girolamo, miniaturist,		— Incorporated Society of, . . .	156
seventeenth century Italian, . . .	259	Arts, the Society of, its dissensions,	156
Ambrosius, brother of Hans Holbein,	83	— — — its encouragement of the	
Anderson, Dr. W., collector of		arts,	157
Japanese paintings,	268	Arundel Psalter, the miniatures in, .	25
Angelico, Fra, fifteenth century		Aschaffenburg library, the missal of	
Italian painter and miniaturist, .	36	Glockendon in the,	45, 46
— — — his miniatures not known, .	36	Attavante, fifteenth century Italian	
Anglo-Celtic school of illumination,		MS. miniaturist,	46
	12, 13	— the 'Missale Romanum' in the	
Anglo-Roman style,	13	Royal Library, Brussels,	47
Anglo-Saxon school or style,	13, 14, 20	Aubert, Louis François, eighteenth	
— — — miniatures,	14, 15	century French enameller,	280

MINIATURES

	PAGE		PAGE
Aubrey, Louis François, eighteenth century French miniaturist, . . .	251	Benninck, Simon, sixteenth century miniaturist of Bruges, . . .	68, 98
Augsburg, Holbein at, . . .	83	— — — his authentic works, . . .	68
Augustin, Jean Baptiste Jacques, eighteenth century French miniaturist and enameller, . . .	286, 250	— — — portraits in the genealogy of Spain and Portugal, . . .	69
Augustine, the missionary, introduces Italian MSS., . . .	13	— — — his daughter, Levina Teerlinck, . . .	68, 71, 98, 99
Augustus, Duke of Saxony, portrait of, . . .	45	Bergmann, Ignaz, eighteenth century German miniaturist, . . .	257
BACON, Francis, miniature portrait of, . . .	113	Bernard, Samuel, seventeenth century French miniaturist, . . .	239
Bailly, Jacques, seventeenth century French miniaturist, . . .	239	Bettes, John, sixteenth century English miniaturist, . . .	107
Baldrighi, Giuseppe, eighteenth century Italian miniaturist, . . .	261	— — — Thomas, his brother, . . .	107
Basle, Holbein at, . . .	83	— — — examples at Montagu House, . . .	107
Battoni, Le Chevalier Pompeo, eighteenth century Italian miniaturist, . . .	261	Bibliothèque Nationale, founded by Charles v., . . .	30
Baudouin, thirteenth century Italian MS. miniaturist, . . .	26	Bichelberger, the sisters, eighteenth century Netherlandish miniaturists, . . .	257
Baur, Georg, seventeenth century Netherlandish miniaturist, . . .	256	Binck, Jacob, fifteenth century illuminator, etc., . . .	45
Beale, Charles, miniaturist, son of Mary Beale, . . .	135	Blachner, Johann Samuel, eighteenth century German miniaturist, . . .	257
— — — Mary, seventeenth century English miniaturist, . . .	135	Black, Mr., discoverer of date of Holbein's death, . . .	89
— — — her diary, . . .	135	Blarenberghe, Louis, eighteenth century French miniaturist, . . .	242
Beauclerc, Lady Diana, nineteenth century English artist, . . .	198	— — — Henry Joseph, his son, . . .	243
Beauneveu, André, fourteenth century Netherlandish MS. miniaturist, etc., . . .	34	— — — their microscopic miniatures, . . .	242
Bedford, Duke of, the breviary of, . . .	31	Blessendorf, Constantin Friedrich, seventeenth century German miniaturist, . . .	256
— — — as patron, . . .	39	Bodleian Library, an illuminated prayer-book in the, . . .	34
— — — portrait of the, in Bedford Missal, . . .	60	Bogle, John, eighteenth century English miniaturist, . . .	174
— — — Missal, its perfection, . . .	60	Bohemia, Frederick of, miniature portrait of, . . .	113
Beer, Johann Friedrich, seventeenth century Netherlandish miniaturist, . . .	256	— — — Elizabeth of, miniature portrait of, . . .	113
Behaim, Sebald Hans, illuminator, etc., . . .	45	Bohkary, sixteenth century Persian miniaturist, . . .	264
— — — Barthel, his brother, . . .	45	Boit, Charles, seventeenth century Swedish enameller, . . .	150, 282, 283
Behzade, sixteenth century Persian miniaturist, . . .	264	— — — his great enamel, . . .	282
— — — his love of Nature, great technical perfection, . . .	265	Bol, Hans, sixteenth century miniaturist, French school, . . .	239
Bekking, eighteenth century Dutch miniaturist, . . .	256	Boleyn, Anne, . . .	87
		Bolognese, Franco, thirteenth century Italian MS. miniaturist, . . .	26

INDEX

	PAGE
Bologna, the university of, . . .	22
Bone, Henry, eighteenth century English enameller, . . .	288
— — — his portraits of illustrious persons, <i>temp.</i> Elizabeth, . . .	288
— — — portrait of the Countess of Dysart, . . .	290
— — — Henry Pierce, his son, . . .	290
'Book of Hours,' contrast between Flemish and French miniatures in, . . .	72
'Book of Hours' of Etienne Chevalier, miniatures by Fouquet, . . .	39
Book of Joshua, Byzantine miniatures in the, . . .	8
Book of Kells, Celtic illuminations in the, . . .	10
Borders, ivy-leaf, in French MSS., . . .	29, 40
Bordier, Jacques, seventeenth century French enameller, . . .	278
— — — Pierre, seventeenth century French enameller, . . .	273, 274
— — — assistant to Petitot, . . .	273, 274, 275, 276, 277
— — — the Fairfax jewel, . . .	274, 275
Bordone, Benedetto, sixteenth century Italian miniaturist, . . .	56
Bos, Louis Janseen, fifteenth century Flemish miniaturist, . . .	255
Bosch, Balthasar Vanden, seventeenth century Netherlandish miniaturist, . . .	256
Boucher, François, eighteenth century French painter, . . .	244
Boulogne, French painter, . . .	254
Bourdichon, Jean, fifteenth century French MS. miniaturist, etc., . . .	57
Bourget, daughter of Jean le Noir, illuminator, . . .	35
Boze, Joseph, eighteenth century French miniaturist, . . .	248
Brabant, miniaturists of, . . .	30
Bradley, J. W., compiler of dictionary of miniaturists, . . .	25, 34, 49
Brandon, Charles, Duke of Suffolk, miniatures of his sons, . . .	90
Brendal, Frederic, seventeenth century French miniaturist and engraver . . .	239
Bretagne, Anne of, Hours of, . . .	58
Brisson, Mlle., eighteenth century French miniaturist, . . .	243

U

	PAGE
Broccio, Frederigo, sixteenth century Italian miniaturist, . . .	56
Brosamer, Hans, fifteenth century German illuminator, etc., . . .	45
Bruckmann, Jean Frederic, eighteenth century miniaturist, French school, . . .	279
Brueghel, Jan, seventeenth century German miniaturist, . . .	255
Bruges, the art centre in the fourteenth century, . . .	30, 31
Buccleuch, Duke of, collector, . . .	296
Buck, Adam and Frederick, eighteenth century English miniaturists, . . .	175
Buda, the royal city of Hungary, visited by Clovio, . . .	50
Buontalenti, Bernardo, sixteenth century genius, MS. miniaturist and pupil of Clovio, . . .	258
Burgundy, Duke of, patron, . . .	39
Byzantine style, miniatures in the, . . .	7, 8
— — — methods of miniaturists, . . .	9, 10
Byzantium, capital of new Roman empire under Constantine, . . .	6
CAMEO, the, new feature in illumination, . . .	
Campagnola, Giulio, seventeenth century Italian MS. miniaturist, . . .	259
Campana, F., eighteenth century French miniaturist, . . .	248
Campeggio, Cardinal, patron of Clovio, . . .	51
Candiana, monastery of, Clovio visits, . . .	51
Capello, Scipio, eighteenth century Italian miniaturist, . . .	261
Care of miniatures, the, . . .	300, 301
Carlisle, Countess of, Lucy Percy, miniature portrait of, . . .	128
Carolingian MSS., . . .	16
— — — miniatures, . . .	16, 17
Carrick, Thomas, nineteenth century English miniaturist, . . .	209
Carriera, Rosalba, eighteenth century miniaturist, French school, . . .	243, 244, 260
— — — in Paris, her influence on the French school, . . .	243
— — — portrait of herself, . . .	244
— — — her Italian birth, . . .	260
— — — her genius and her friends, . . .	260

305

MINIATURES

	PAGE		PAGE
Carriera, Rosalba, her art, portraits in pastel,	260	<i>Chronicles of England</i> , Flemish illuminations and miniatures,	71
Catherine de Medicis, 'Book of Hours,' portraits in the,	63	<i>Chroniques de Saint Denis</i> ,	35
Celtic illumination,	10	Cimabue, thirteenth century painter, Italian,	27
— 'Book of Kells' at Trinity College, Dublin,	10	Claypole, Elizabeth, miniature portrait of,	130
— miniatures of the early Irish period,	11	Clement VII., Pope, fragment of Italian choir-book,	47, 48
— — symbolic figure-drawing,	11	Cleveland, Duchess of, Barbara Villiers, miniature of,	117
— — refined feeling for colour,	11	Clouet, François (Janet), sixteenth century painter and miniaturist,	236
— — the restrictions of the Romish Church,	11, 12	— — miniature of Mary Queen of Scots,	237
— — the 'Durham Book,' the illuminations, the miniatures,	12	— — miniature of Marie de Clèves,	238
— — school combined with Byzantine in tenth century,	17	— — his style and portrait drawings,	238
— — its imaginative qualities and minute manipulation,	18	— — the family of,	235, 236
Chalon, Alfred Edward, nineteenth century miniaturist, English school,	207	— — Jehan, painter,	235
— — his brother John James,	208	— — II., Jean,	236
Change in fashions in Charles I.'s reign, its influence on miniatures,	131	Clovio, Giulio, sixteenth century Italian illuminator and MS. miniaturist,	48
Charlemagne, Emperor, patron,	15	— — portraits in the MS.,	49, 55
— — the great stimulus to European art,	15	— — British Museum MS. by,	53
— — his convictions,	15	— — the stippling method,	53
— — the foundation of the Palatine school,	16	— — the Soane Museum MS. by,	54
— — the 'Evangeliare' of,	16	'Codex Aureus,' a Carolingian Evangelium,	17
Charles I., as Prince of Wales, miniature portrait of,	113	Codex-Purpureo Argentius, example of purple vellum,	5, 6
— — his encouragement of the arts,	152	Collections—	
— — his collection of pictures,	152, 153	of Henry VIII.,	152, 294
— — II., miniature portrait of,	126	of Charles I.,	152, 295
— — restoration of,	133	Royal, at Windsor,	294, 295
— — v., founder of the Bibliothèque Nationale,	30	Montagu House,	296, 297
— — VI., patron,	35	Welbeck,	297
Charlier, Jacques, eighteenth century French miniaturist,	244	Duke of Devonshire's,	297
— — his portrait of Countess du Barri,	245	the Magniac,	298
Chartier, Pierre, enameller, pupil of Jean Toutin,	273	others,	298, 299
Chéron, Elizabeth Sophie, seventeenth century French miniaturist,	279	Collections and collectors,	293
Christian art, early,	6	our national collections,	293, 294
		the Wallace collection,	293
		Victoria and Albert Museum,	293
		Collectors and patrons,	294, 295
		Henry VIII.,	152, 294
		Charles I.,	152, 295
		Cromwell,	153, 294

INDEX

	PAGE		PAGE
Collectors and patrons—		Corvinus Library,	50
George III. and George IV.,	294	Cosway, Maria, wife of Richard	
Duke of Buccleuch,	296	Cosway,	190
Duke of Portland,	297	— — — and Angelica Kauffmann,	191
Duke of Devonshire,	297	— — — her arrival in London, her	
Collins, Richard, eighteenth century		pictures,	191
English miniaturist and ena-		— — — her miniatures,	192
meller,	161	— — — at Lodi,	192
— Samuel, eighteenth century		— Richard, eighteenth century	
English miniaturist,	161	English miniaturist,	158
Comerford, John, eighteenth century		— — — his style, 158, 160, 178,	179
Irish miniaturist,	174	— — — his grasp of essentials,	159
Commentaires de Cesar, the,	61, 236	— — — ivory as a base,	159
Commonwealth, its influence on art,	153	— — — not to be imitated,	160
— Samuel Cooper, miniaturist of,	123	— — — his manner of life,	179
Composition in the miniature por-		— — — his early successes,	180
trait,	196	— — — his earliest miniatures,	181
— in the various schools com-		— — — Mrs. Fitzherbert,	182
pared,	196, 197	— — — at Stratford Place,	183
Constantine the Great, Christian		— — — his death at Edgeware	
Emperor of the Romans,	6	Road,	185
Constantinople, or Byzantium, the		Cosway's miniatures, and 'stained	
centre of Byzantine art,	6, 18	pencil drawings,	186, 187
Cook, Sir Francis, miniatures by		— — — at Windsor,	187
Holbein belonging to,	96	— classical compositions,	188
Cooper, Alexander, seventeenth cen-		— portrait of Mrs. Butler,	189
tury English miniaturist, brother		— portrait of Lady Manners,	189
to Samuel,	118, 119	— portrait of Elizabeth Foster,	
— Samuel, seventeenth century		Duchess of Devonshire,	189
English miniaturist,	118, 121	— portrait of the Prince Regent,	189
— — — his supremacy,	121	Cote, Samuel, eighteenth century	
— — — his copies of Vandyck,	123	English miniaturist and enameller,	
— — — his earliest miniatures for		173, 291	
Louis XIV.,	123	— Francis, brother of Samuel,	291
— — — portraits of Cromwell, 123, 124		Courtois, Nicholas André, eighteenth	
— — — the Buccleuch collection,	124, 125	century French enameller,	285
— — — his reticence,	125	Cramer, Nicholas, seventeenth cen-	
— — — his unfinished portraits,	125, 126, 127	tury Netherlandish miniaturist,	256
— — — his methods, 127, 128, 132, 133		Cranach, Lucas, sixteenth century	
— — — his ladies' portraits,	128, 129, 130	German painter and miniaturist,	
— — — his art compared with		86, 96, 255	
previous painters,	130	— — — portrait of Erasmus by,	96
Cooper and Cosway compared, 143, 158		— — — his various mediums,	255
Cornelisz, Lucas, sixteenth century		Crane, Walter, on the 'Block Books,'	44
Dutch painter,	79, 86, 92	Crewe, Miss, eighteenth century	
Corona, Leonardo, a miniature copy-		artist,	198
ist of Titian,	259	Crosse, Laurence, seventeenth cen-	
Corvinus, Matthias, patron and col-		tury English miniaturist,	144, 145
lector,	50	— — — his characteristics,	145
		— — — his miniatures,	145
		— Richard, eighteenth century	
		English miniaturist,	167

MINIATURES

	PAGE		PAGE
Crosse, Richard, his unsuccessful courtship,	167	de Châtillon, Louis, his water-colour miniatures,	241
Cumberland, Earl of, Hilliard's miniature portrait of,	103	Decorative motive in mediæval miniatures,	19
Cuper, Marguerite and Madeline, wives of Petitot and Bordier,	278	de Heere, Lucas, sixteenth century Flemish portrait-painter,	79
DA CARPI, Alberto Pio, famous contemporary of Clovio,	50	de Hesdin, Jacquemart, MS. miniaturist to Jean de Berri,	34
da Cremona, Girolamo, fifteenth century Italian illuminator,	46	de Holanda, Francisca, contemporary miniaturist with Clovio,	56
dai Libri, Girolamo, fifteenth century Italian MS. miniaturist,	48	de Houvre, Guiot, thirteenth century Italian illuminator,	26
— — — the 'Hours' by,	56	de la Riviere, Didier, early sixteenth century painter and MS. miniaturist of Bruges,	68
Damer, Hon. Mrs., eighteenth century English sculptor,	197	de Limbourg, Pol, fourteenth century Netherlandish illuminator,	34
Daniels, Abraham, eighteenth century English miniaturist,	175	della Francesca, Pietro, fifteenth century promoter of perspective,	36
da Panicale, Masolino, early fifteenth century Italian painter,	36	de Luxembourg, Bonne, Duchess of Limbourg, wife of King John,	39
da Verona, Liberale, Siennese MS. miniaturist, fifteenth century,	46	de Manière, Fabian, early sixteenth century painter and MS. miniaturist of Bruges,	68
David, Jacob, a letter to, concerning Holbein's decease,	89	de Mayence, Sir Theodore Turquet, physician to Charles I. and collaborator with Petitot,	274
da Vinci, Leonardo, as a miniaturist,	44	de Mirbel, Madame Lizenska Aimée Zoe, early nineteenth century French miniaturist and enameller,	250, 251
David, Gerard, fifteenth century miniaturist and illuminator of Bruges,	66, 67	Demosthenes, the sixteenth century Italian MS. in British Museum,	47
— — — the Soane Museum MS.,	64	Denmark, Anne of, miniature of,	110
— — — authentic works of,	66, 67	de Pamplona, Pedro, thirteenth century Spanish MS. miniaturist,	26
— — — wife of,	67	de Pizan, Christiani, fourteenth century Italian MS. miniaturist,	35
— — — Adrian, pupil of,	68	de Raet, Adriaen, <i>alias</i> Vrelant, early sixteenth century illuminator of Bruges,	68
Dayes, Edward, eighteenth century English engraver and miniaturist,	175	Derby, Earl of, collector,	108
de Bailly, Guillaume, Froissart chronicles illuminated by,	30	— — — miniature portrait of Countess of, by Cooper,	129
de Berri, Duc, patron, fourteenth century,	34	de Scheyren, Conrad, famous thirteenth century miniaturist, illuminator, and prior,	26
de Bourbon, Jeanne, wife of Charles v.,	34	de Smytere, Anne, miniaturist and mother of Lucas de Heere,	79
de Bruges, Jean, MS. miniaturist to Charles v.,	35	de Trevoux, Henri, fourteenth century French MS. miniaturist,	35
Decadence of miniature painting, early eighteenth century,	142		
de Carvanoy, Oudin, fourteenth century Netherlandish MS. miniaturist,	35		
Decline of the art in the nineteenth century,	200		
de Châtillon, Louis, seventeenth century French miniaturist and enameller,	241, 278		

INDEX

	PAGE		PAGE
De Troy, French painter and miniaturist,	254	Ducieux, Joseph, eighteenth century French miniaturist,	248
Devereux, Robert, Earl of Essex, Hilliard miniature of,	104	Dudley, Lady, Holbein miniature at Windsor,	90
— — — miniature of, by John Bettes,	107	— Robert, Earl of Leicester, Hilliard miniature at Montagu House,	103
Devonshire, Duke of, the Benedictional by Godemann, belonging to,	14	Du Guernier, family of enamellers,	280
— — — miniature of Elizabeth Cecil, Countess of,	130	— Louis, sixteenth century French miniaturist and illuminator,	239, 240
Deynum, Jean Baptiste, seventeenth century Netherlands miniaturist,	255	— Louis, the younger, miniaturist,	240
Djehanghyr, sixteenth century Persian painter,	264	— Pierre and François, enamellers,	240
di Buoninsigna, Duccio, thirteenth century Italian MS. miniaturist,	26	Dumont, François, French painter,	254
Didot, Mons., French writer,	44	Durand, L., eighteenth century French enameller,	285
Digby, Sir Kenelm, miniatures of,	113	Dürer, Albert, German painter and designer,	45, 78
— — — as an emissary,	113	'Durham Book,' Celtic MS. in British Museum,	12
di Giovanni, Matteo, Sienese miniaturist,	28		
Dilke, Lady, writer,	59	EDRIDGE, Henry, eighteenth century English miniaturist,	172
di Mariano, Pellegrini, Sienese miniaturist,	28	— — — copies from Reynolds,	173
Dinglinger, Johann Melchior, seventeenth century miniaturist, German school,	256	Edward III., patron,	39
— — — Georg Friedrich,	256	— VI., portraits of, assigned to Holbein,	89
— — — Sophie,	256	— — — miniatures of,	89, 99
Diotisalvi, thirteenth century Italian MS. miniaturist,	26	Egley, William, early nineteenth century English miniaturist,	210
di Paolo, Giovanni, MS. miniaturist, Sienese school,	28	Egypt, the parent land of illumination,	5
<i>Divina Commedia</i> , fourteenth century MS.,	20	Eleanor of Austria, enamel portrait of,	272
Dixon, John, late seventeenth century English miniaturist,	138	Eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries,	18
— — — Nathaniel, seventeenth century English miniaturist,	136	Élie, Vincent François, eighteenth century French miniaturist,	242
— — — his miniatures,	136, 137	Elizabeth, Queen, miniatures of,	99
— — — portrait of Lady Crispe,	137	— — — Hilliard's appointment to,	101
Dobson, pupil of Sir Robert Peake,	117	— — — miniatures by Hilliard,	103, 104
Don Lorenzo, thirteenth century Florentine MS. miniaturist,	26	Elszner, Jakob, fifteenth century German MS. miniaturist, pupil of Dürer,	45
d'Orleans, Girart, fourteenth century painter to King John,	35	Enamellers in England,	284, 286
Douglas, Langton, writer,	36	Enamels, the first fashion for,	150
Dow, Gerard, painter,	258	— <i>cloisonné</i> ,	269
Drake, Sir William, collector,	79, 96	— <i>champlevé</i> ,	269, 270
Dubié, pupil of Toutin, enameller,	273	— painted,	270
		— translucent,	271
		— painting in and painting on,	272

MINIATURES

England, deplorable state of the arts in,	PAGE 151
Engleheart, J. C. Dillman, early nineteenth century English miniaturist,	172
— George, eighteenth century English miniaturist,	170
— — his miniatures and copies from Reynolds,	170, 171
— — his manner and painter-like qualities,	171, 172
— Sir J. G. D., collection of,	171
Erasmus, Desiderius, patron of Holbein,	83
— — miniature portrait of,	84
Essex, Countess of, miniature of the,	110, 111
Essex, William, early nineteenth century English enameller,	291
Eugenius iv., Pope, portrait by Fouquet,	38
'Evangeliaire' of Charlemagne,	16
FABER, John, the elder, seventeenth century English miniaturist in plumbago,	140
Fabian, Adriaen, sixteenth century master painter and miniaturist of Bruges,	68
Faithorne, William, seventeenth century English miniaturist,	117
Farnese, Alessandro, patron of Giulio Clovio,	49
Fashion for <i>bonbonnières</i> , etc.,	253
Fenollosa, Mr., collector of Japanese paintings,	291
Ferrand, Jacques Philippe, seventeenth century French enameller,	279
Ferrara, the school of, fifteenth century,	33, 44
Fifteenth century,	35
Filarete, Antonio, Italian master of Fouquet,	38
Filippo Lippo, Fra, Italian painter, contemporary of Fra Angelico,	36
Finney, Samuel, eighteenth century English miniaturist and enameller,	161, 288
First epoch of English miniature painting,	98

	PAGE
Fisher, John, sketch portrait of,	84
Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge,	27
— 'Book of the Order of the Golden Fleece,'	65
Flamel, Jean, fourteenth century Netherlandish MS. miniaturist,	35
Flanders, the MS. miniaturists of,	30
Flatman, Thomas, seventeenth cen- tury English miniaturist,	133
— — his finest miniatures,	134
— — his satires,	135
— — portrait of Mr. Symson,	135
Flemish Book of Hours, miniature from,	48
— school,	32, 63
Flodstone, Anne (Mrs. Mee), eighteenth century English minia- turist,	197, 198
— — (Mrs. Mee), miniature of Mrs. Udney, by,	198
Florence, school of illuminators and miniaturists at,	44
Foreign Miniaturists,	235
Forster, Thomas, early eighteenth century miniaturist in plumbago,	140
— — portrait of William III.,	140
Fouquet, Jean, fifteenth century French MS. miniaturist and painter,	34, 37, 57
Fourteenth century,	28
Fox, Charles, eighteenth century English miniaturist,	175
Franco, Battisto, sixteenth century painter of Urbino,	56
Frankfort, the art of wood-engraving at,	45
Franks, Sir A. W., and Holbein's will,	89
Fratellini, Giovanna, seventeenth century Italian miniaturist,	259, 260
— — rival to Rosalba,	260
French school,	22, 57, 61
— MS. miniatures, especial features,	29
— — under Italian influence,	57
— — portrait miniaturists,	240
— — their methods,	243, 244 246, 253
— Revolution, its effect on the art of miniature,	248
Froissart, the historian,	30
Füger, Heinrich Friedrich, eighteenth century German miniaturist,	257

INDEX

	PAGE		PAGE
GAINSBOROUGH, English painter, . . .	154	Gozzoli, Benozzo, contemporary of	
Galantini, Ippolito, seventeenth cen-		Fra Angelico,	36
tury Italian miniaturist, . . .	259	Greek artists at Byzantium in fourth	
Garzoni, Giovanna, seventeenth		century,	6
century Italian miniaturist, . . .	259	— Genesis of Vienna, fifth cen-	
Genesis, Cottonian, in the British		tury MS.,	6
Museum,	6	Greuze, Jean B., French painter, . . .	254
George II. and the arts,	157	Gribelin, Isaac, painter in pastel,	
Gerbier, Sir Balthasar, seventeenth		assistant to Jean Toutin, . . .	273
century miniaturist, English school,	116	Grimaldi, William, eighteenth cen-	
— — — Duke of Buckingham, his		tury English miniaturist, . . .	175
patron,	116	Grimani Breviary, famous Flemish	
— — — successor to Inigo Jones, . . .	116	MS. at St. Mark's, Venice, . . .	71
— — — Prince Charles, drawing		Grimani, Cardinal Marino, patron, . .	49
of,	117	— — — portrait of, by Clovio, . . .	55
German and Netherlandish portrait		<i>Grisaille</i> applicable to enamels, . . .	271
miniaturists,	254	— in illuminated MSS., French	
— — — their Flemish origin, 254, 255		school,	29
Gibson, Richard, called the dwarf, . .	139	Greenhill, John, seventeenth century	
Gierke, Dr., collector of Japanese		English miniaturist, pupil of Sir	
paintings,	291	P. Lely,	136
Giordano, Sophie, early nineteenth		— — — his miniatures,	136
century Italian miniaturist, . . .	261		
Giotto, thirteenth century Italian		HAINAULT, fourteenth century illu-	
painter,	27, 33	minimators and miniaturists of, . .	30
Glockendon, Albert, fifteenth century		Hall, Pierre Adolphe, eighteenth	
MS. miniaturist, German school, .	45	century French miniaturist, . . .	245, 285
— — — family of,	46	— — — his early life,	245
— — — George, brother of Albert, . . .	45	— — — studied the old masters, . . .	245
— — — Nicolaus, the missal of Albert		— — — excellence of his tech-	
of Brandenburg,	45, 46	nique,	246
Godefroy, sixteenth century French		— — — his style and manner, 246, 247	
MS. miniaturist,	61, 62	— — — examples at Hertford	
Godemann, Monk of St. Swithin's,		House,	246
tenth century English MS. minia-		— — — his enamels not known, . . .	285
turist,	14	— — — Monsieur Villot's bio-	
Godfrey, Sir E., miniature of, . . .	120, 121	graphy,	285
'Golden Book of Edgar,' tenth cen-		Hans, Louis, seventeenth century	
tury illuminated MS. in the British		French miniaturist,	239
Museum,	14	Hay, Lady, Duchess of Carlisle,	
Gossart, John, known as Mabuse,		portrait of,	111
fifteenth century Netherlandish		Hayter, Charles, eighteenth century	
painter,	78	English miniaturist,	176
Gotescale, eighth century scribe, . .	16	— Sir George, son of Charles,	
Gothic style, its influence on the		painter and miniaturist, . . .	176
MS. miniatures,	23	Heath, Henry Charles, nineteenth	
— — — a return to nature,	23	century English miniaturist, . .	214
Goupy, Louis, early eighteenth cen-		— — — his miniatures of Queen	
tury French miniaturist,	149	Victoria,	214
— — — Joseph, nephew to Louis, . . .	149	— — — his miniature portrait of	
— — — Bernard, brother of Joseph, . .	149	the Duke of Clarence,	215
Goya, Spanish painter,	258		

MINIATURES

	PAGE		PAGE
Heath, Lionel, modern minia- turist,	230	Holbein, Hans, miniatures recently brought to light,	95
Henry VIII., sixteenth century MS. portrait group,	48	— quality of technique,	96
— associated with Holbein,	82	Holbeinesque manner described,	82
— collection of pictures,	152	Holford, Robert, miniature of Lucy Percy bought by,	113
Henry IV., <i>Froissart's Chronicles</i> illuminated for,	30	Holland, Mrs., portrait of,	111
Hilliard, Nicholas, sixteenth century English miniaturist,	100	Holmes, James, eighteenth century English miniaturist,	209
— as a goldsmith,	100	— portrait of Lord Byron,	209
— appointment to Elizabeth,	101	Hone, Nathaniel, eighteenth century English enameller,	161, 287
— his sense of decoration,	101	— Horace, son, enameller,	287
— method of painting,	101, 105, 106	Horenbout, or Hornebolt, etc., Gerard, sixteenth century painter and MS. miniaturist of Ghent,	70, 87, 92
— portraits of Elizabeth,	102, 103	— Gerard, 'Hours of the Blessed Virgin,'	70
— Royal collection,	102	— Susanna, daughter of, a miniaturist,	71
— on Holbein,	86	— Lucas, sixteenth century water-colour painter, master to Holbein,	86
Hoby, Sir Thomas,	99	Horwitz, Helena, modern minia- turist,	230
Hoefnagel, Georg, sixteenth century Netherlandish MS. miniaturist,	56	Hoskins, John, seventeenth century English miniaturist,	118
Hogarth, William, eighteenth cen- tury English painter,	154	— Graham on,	118
— his revolt against conven- tionalism,	155	— his disciples,	118
— a gallery of modern paint- ings,	155	— his miniatures,	119
— the study of nature,	155	— his ladies' portraits,	120
Hokusai, nineteenth century Jap- anese painter,	267	— his treatment,	121
— his realism,	267, 268	'Hours of Anne of Brittany,' French illuminated MS.,	34
Holbein, Hans, sixteenth century German painter and miniaturist,	76	Howard, Catherine, miniature of,	90
— his pre-eminence,	76	— Henry, Earl of Surrey, minia- ture of,	100
— his style,	76	Hudson, eighteenth century English painter,	154
— at Basle,	83, 88	Humphry, Ozias, eighteenth century English miniaturist,	163
— contemporaries,	79	— in London,	164
— drawings,	92	— in India,	165
— death,	89	— failing sight,	165
— genius,	81	— technical execution,	166
— visits to England,	84	— miniatures at Windsor,	166
— miniatures,	85		
— miniatures of Henry VIII.,	87	ILIAD, fragments of, fifth century MS.,	6
— salary from the Royal household,	89	Illumination, death-blow to,	41
— will,	89		
— master in water-colour, Walpole's opinion,	86		
— miniatures in Royal col- lection,	90, 91		
— miniatures at Montagu House,	94		

INDEX

	PAGE		PAGE
Illuminations produced at Bruges, .	63	Jansen, Cornelius, other portraits, .	116
— Portuguese,	73	Japanese art,	266
— German,	73	— — its oldest picture,	266
— Spanish,	73	— — in the ninth century,	266
Illuminators' Guild,	31	— — Kose Kanaoka, portraits,	266
Imperial library at St. Petersburg, .	32	— — Toba Sôjo,	266
Indian art,	262	— — the humorous style,	266
— illumination,	262	Jennings, Sarah, Duchess of Marl-	
— paintings applied to glass,	262	borough, portrait of,	145, 146
— frescoes in caves of Ad-		Jervas, English portrait painter, .	144
junta,	263	John, King, patron,	33
Iona, Celtic art at,	12	Jones, Charlotte, nineteenth century	
Isabella of Castile, Breviary of, .	73	English miniaturist,	198
Isabey, Jean Baptiste, eighteenth		Josetsou, naturalised Japanese artist, .	267
century French miniaturist, .	248	Justinian, Emperor, sixth century, .	7
— — his early work,	249		
— — his connection with		KAKEMONOS,	267
Napoleon,	249	Kapour, Persian painter,	265
— — his paper drawings,	249	Kauffmann, Angelica, eighteenth	
— — his new transparent		century painter and miniaturist,	
method,	250	English school,	197, 199
— — Monsieur Villot's opinion, .	250	Kijô, Emperor, and the school of	
Italian school,	22, 258	rapid sketching,	266
— — portrait miniaturists,	258	Killigrew, Anne, eighteenth century	
Ivory, a new base,	142	English miniaturist,	136
— its influence on miniature		Klingstedt, Karl Gustav, seventeenth	
painting,	142	century miniaturist, French school, .	247
— sensitive to change of tempera-		Kneller, Sir Godfrey, eighteenth	
ture,	300	century English painter,	141, 144
— mounting of miniatures,	300		
— framing,	300	LABITTE, Alphonse, writer,	26
— mildew and its cure,	300, 301	Laborde, M. de, writer,	37
— darkening of Chinese white,	301	Lacroix, M., writer,	30
— retouching and repairing,	301	Largillière, early eighteenth century	
— the effects of gum,	301, 302	French painter,	254
— the expert and the expert		le Blond, Jacob Christoph, Nether-	
painter,	301	landish miniaturist,	256
— a special scraper,	234, 301	le Bon, Jean,	34
		Lehmann, Leo, nineteenth century	
JACQUEMIN, sixteenth century French		German miniaturist,	258
MS. miniaturist,	35	Lely, Sir Peter, seventeenth century	
Jaffé, Monsieur Albert, <i>Miniatur-</i>		English painter,	133
<i>Katalog</i> ,	257, 258	— — his pupils, 134, 135, 136, 138	
Jamesone, George, seventeenth cen-		Lens, Bernard, early eighteenth cen-	
tury Scotch miniaturist,	139, 140	tury English miniaturist,	146, 147,
Jansen, Cornelius, seventeenth cen-		148, 159	
tury Dutch painter and minia-		— — his manner of painting, .	
turist,	115	146, 147	
— — portrait of John Pym,	115		
— — portrait of Sir Nicholas			
Crispe,	115		

MINIATURES

	PAGE		PAGE
Lens, Bernard, his miniatures,	147, 159	MABUSE, sixteenth century Nether-	
—— his two sons,	148	landish painter and miniaturist, 63, 92	
le Noir, Jean, fourteenth century		Mackay, Mr., of Colnaghi's, dis-	
French MS. miniaturist,	35	coverer of miniature by Holbein,	94
Leo x., Pope, MS. miniature por-		Madden, Sir Frederick, writer,	16
trait of,	48	Madonna by Holbein,	83
Licinio, Giovanni Antonio, early six-		Makimonos,	267
teenth century Italian painter and		Mancirius, thirteenth century Eng-	
MS. miniaturist,	258	lish illuminator,	26
Light and shade, the study of,	36	Mani, Persian painter,	265
Limoges, school of,	270, 271	—— his pupil Shoudja-ed-Daoulah,	265
—— enamel of Fouquet at the		Mansion, nineteenth century French	
Louvre,	38	miniaturist,	253
Limousin school, the,	269	Mantua school, fifteenth century,	44
—— Leonard, sixteenth century		Manuel, brothers, fourteenth century	
enameller of Limoges,	271	French MS. miniaturists,	35
—— his new method,	271, 272	Manuscripts, earliest,	4
—— his portraits,	272	—— early illuminated,	5
Lindisfarne, school of early Celtic		—— miniature portraits in	69
illumination,	12	Marmocchini, Giovanni, eighteenth	
Liotard, Jean Étienne, eighteenth		century Italian miniaturist,	259
century French miniaturist and		Mary Queen of Scots, portrait of,	29
enameller,	280	Masaccio, fifteenth century Italian	
—— his travels,	151	painter,	36
—— his fertility,	280	Mason, Sir John,	99
—— portrait of Marivaux,	281	Massé, Jean Baptiste, eighteenth	
—— miniature of Lady Mon-		century French miniaturist and	
tagu,	281	enameller,	241, 279
—— portrait of Marie Antoi-		Masson, Richard, eighteenth century	
nette,	281	French miniaturist,	251
Lippo, Memmi, thirteenth century		Master painters,	32
Sieneze miniaturist,	28	Mathias, Corvinus, King of Hungary,	
'Lives of the Saints,' British Museum		patron,	46
MS., school of Giotto,	27	Mathieu, Jean Adam, eighteenth	
<i>Livres de Chœur</i> , the miniaturists of		century French enameller,	279
the Italian,	46	Matsys, Quentin, Netherlandish	
Loggan, David, seventeenth century		painter,	78
English miniaturist in plumbago,	140	Maubert, Madame, eighteenth cen-	
Loggie, Vatican, the decorations of		tury French miniaturist,	242
the,	50	Mehun sur Yèvre, palace at,	34
Lombardy, the art of,	33	Meitshio, Japanese painter,	266, 267
Longhi, Giuseppe, eighteenth cen-		Melder, Gerard, eighteenth century	
tury Italian miniaturist,	261	Netherlandish miniaturist,	256
Lorenzo, Fra, MS. miniaturist of		Memling, Hans, fifteenth century	
Italian choir-books,	46	Netherlandish painter,	32, 63
Louis II., patron of Clovio,	50	Mengs, Antonio Raffaele, eighteenth	
—— IX., portraits of, in the late		century German miniaturist,	256
thirteenth century MSS.,	23	—— Ishmael,	256
Low Countries, the artists of,	65	—— Julia,	256
Lucan, Lady, eighteenth century		<i>Menus plaisirs</i> ,	243
English miniaturist,	198	Meyer, Adleberg, burgomaster of	
Lufft, Hans, the Nuremberg Bible of,	45	Basle,	89

INDEX

	PAGE		PAGE
Meyer, Jacob, burgomaster, . . .	83	NAISH, John, William, and Edward, late eighteenth century English miniaturists, . . .	175
— Jeremiah, eighteenth century English enameller, . . .	160, 287	Naples, fifteenth century school of MS. decoration, . . .	44
Michael Angelo, Italian painter of the Renaissance, . . .	44	National collections, . . .	293, 294
Mignard, French painter, . . .	254	— — our indifference, . . .	293, 294
Milton, John, Cooper's portrait of, . . .	125	Nattier, M., writer, . . .	251
— — Jansen's portrait of, . . .	115	Netherlandish school, . . .	31, 33
Miniature, its derivation, . . .	4	Netscher, Caspar, seventeenth cen- tury German miniaturist, . . .	136
— painting, its greatest epoch, . . .	118	Newcastle, miniature of John Holles, Duke of, . . .	145
Miniatures, Byzantine, . . .	7	New Minster, scriptorium at Win- chester, . . .	13
— English, distinctive charac- teristics, . . .	75	Newton, Sir William J., nineteenth century English miniaturist, . . .	209
— the authenticity of, . . .	81	Niccolo di Ser Sozzo Tagliacci, thir- teenth century Siennese MS. miniaturist, . . .	28
— in oil, . . .	115	Nichols, J. G., writer, . . .	98
— in plumbago, . . .	140	Nicolas, L., thirteenth century French MS. miniaturist, . . .	26
— on enamel, . . .	269	Nixon, James, eighteenth century English miniaturist, . . .	167
Miniaturists, mediæval, their names, 'Missale Romanum,' fifteenth cen- tury MS. by Attavante, . . .	25 47	Norgate, Edward, treatise on Minia- ture, . . .	93
Modern miniature painting, . . .	218	Northern schools of MS. miniaturists, 15, 19	
— — the professional aspect, . . .	219	Nuremberg, the presses of, . . .	45
— — manners of expression, . . .	219	— Bible by Hans Lufft, . . .	45
— — difficulties to contend with, . . .	220		
— — baneful influence of photography, . . .	220	OERTAL, Abraham, contemporary of Hoefnagel, . . .	56
— — unselective imitation, . . .	220	Oglethorpe Bible, . . .	59
— — the degree of elaboration, . . .	221	Oliver, Isaac, sixteenth century English miniaturist, . . .	108
— — evils of stippling, . . .	222	— — pupil of Hilliard and Zuccherro, . . .	108
— — other methods, . . .	222	— — his miniatures, . . .	109, 110
— — <i>gouache</i> , or French method, . . .	222, 223	— — portrait of Countess of Essex, . . .	110, 111
— — the Cosway craze, . . .	223	— — his methods, . . .	111, 112
— — painters, . . .	230	— Peter, pupil and son of Isaac, English miniaturist, . . .	112
Moir, E., nineteenth century Eng- lish miniaturist, . . .	217	— — copies of pictures, . . .	112
Monastic period, . . .	21	— — miniatures by, . . .	113
Monmouth, Duke of, James, por- trait of, . . .	125	— — portrait of Lady Lucy Percy, . . .	113
Montacute, Lord, group by Isaac Oliver, . . .	112	— — Digby portraits, . . .	113
More, Sir Antonio, sixteenth century Netherlandish painter and minia- turist, . . .	79	'Opus, Angelicum,' Anglo-Saxon style, . . .	20
— family, miniature of, . . .	85		
— Sir Thomas, patron, . . .	84, 92		
Morlière, pupil of Toutin, . . .	273		
Moser, Michael, eighteenth century enameller and miniaturist, . . .	160, 287		
— Mary, his daughter, miniaturist, . . .	160		
Mott, Alice, modern miniaturist, . . .	230		

MINIATURES

	PAGE		PAGE
Orange, portrait of Mary, Princess of,	120	Persian portraiture,	264
Oriental miniatures,	261	— the school of Ahmed-Febryzy,	264
— — — Persian,	262, 263, 264	— imported methods and material,	265
— — — Chinese,	265, 266, 267	Perspective, study of,	36
— — — Japanese,	266, 267, 268	Petitot, Jean, seventeenth century	
Origin of Eastern art, the,	261	French enameller,	240, 273
Ormond, portrait of James, Duke of,	149	— — — his father,	273
		— — — in London,	274
		— — — discovers new colours,	274
		— — — at Whitehall,	274
PACHECO, master and father-in-law		— — — Royal portraits,	274
of Valasquez, writer on art,	52	— — — and Vandyck,	274
Painting, the art of, in England,	75	— — — his collaborator, Bordier,	274
Palatine school, at Aix-la-Chapelle,		— — — in Paris at the Louvre,	275
founded by Charlemagne,	16	— — — sent to prison,	275
Palatine, Charles Louis, Count, por-		— — — examples in various col-	
trait of,	113	lections,	275, 276, 277, 278
Palazzo Municipale, Sienese illum-		— — — the Jones collection,	275
inations at the,	28	— — — enamel portrait of Cardinal	
Palmer, Miss Theophile, eighteenth		Mazarin,	277
century English miniaturist,	198	— — — enamel portrait of Rachel	
Paolo, Uccello, fifteenth century		de Ruigny,	278
Italian painter, the study of per-		— — — portrait of himself,	277
spective,	36	— — — Jean Louis, son of Jean,	
Paper, use of in MSS.,	23	enameller,	278
Papyrus,	5	Philip Augustus, the establishment	
Parma, Duchess of, patron,	52	of universities,	22
— Duke of, portrait of,	52	— II. of Spain,	52, 79
Paul III., uncle of Cardinal Farnese,	49	— IV., tomb of,	34
Peake, Sir Robert, seventeenth cen-		— the Good, portrait of,	65
tury English painter and engraver,	117	Photography and the unskilled	
— — — his portraits,	117	painter,	229
— — — his pupils,	117	Pictorial realism,	40
‘Pélerinage Jésus-Crist,’ fourteenth		Pinchon, Jean, early sixteenth cen-	
century MS. by Oudin de Carvanoy,	35	tury French MS. miniaturist,	62
Penez, Georg, a ‘little master,’ Ger-		Plastel, Jacques, early sixteenth cen-	
man designer,	45	tury French MS. miniaturist,	62
Penicaud, Nardon, fifteenth century		Plimer, Andrew and Nathaniel,	
French enameller,	270	eighteenth century English minia-	
— Jean I., enameller,	271	turists,	193
— Jean II., enameller,	271	— — — ‘The Three Graces,’	193
— Jean III., enameller,	271	— — — mannerisms and methods,	
— Pierre, enameller,	271		194, 196
Pepys, Samuel,	3	— — — meretricious handling,	195
— — — portrait of,	145	— — — miniature of the Duke of	
Périn, Louis, pupil of Sicardi,		Devonshire,	194
eighteenth century French minia-		Plott, John, eighteenth century	
turist,	254	English enameller,	173, 291
Perréal, Jean, early sixteenth cen-		Pompei, the paintings of,	7
tury French MS. miniaturist,	57, 58	Portland, Duke of, collector,	95, 104
Persian art of painting,	262	— Duchess of,	113
— capital, Ispahan, famous for		Portraiture, evolution of,	42
its miniaturists,	263		

INDEX

	PAGE
Portraits, Netherlandish, . . .	76, 77
——— their characteristics, . . .	77
——— miniature, in oil, . . .	80
——— the duplicating of notable, . . .	81
Poyet, Jean, sixteenth century French MS. miniaturist of Tours, . . .	58
Prayer-book of Queen Elizabeth, . . .	103
Present state of the profession, 230, 231	
Prévost, Jean, eighteenth century French miniaturist, . . .	242
Prewitt, William, eighteenth century English enameller, . . .	161, 287
——— miniature of Horace Walpole, . . .	287
Printing, the invention of, . . .	42
Prior, Matthew, miniature of . . .	147
Propert, Dr. J. Lumsden, writer and collector, . . .	39, 49
——— disposal of his collection, 104	
Psalter, Egerton collection, famous Byzantine MS., twelfth century, . . .	8
'Psychomachia,' the Cottonian collection, Anglo-Saxon MS., . . .	21
Pucelle, Jean, fourteenth century MS. miniaturist, . . .	35
Puritans, the, and art, . . .	153
 RAEBURN, Sir Henry, eighteenth century Scots painter and miniaturist, . . .	 176
——— David Martin, his master, 176	
——— his success as a portrait painter, . . .	176, 177
Ramelli, Padre Felice, eighteenth century Italian miniaturist, . . .	259
Realism in art, greater, . . .	43
Reformation, its influence on art, . . .	151
Religious inspiration, . . .	19
Renaissance, the, . . .	28
Renaissance, English, three great portrait painters, . . .	154, 158
——— painters on enamel, . . .	160
——— ornament, . . .	47
——— of miniature painting, . . .	154
Revival, the late nineteenth century, 215	
——— without character or individuality, . . .	215
Reynolds, Miss Frances, eighteenth century English miniaturist, . . .	198
——— miniature of Dr. Johnson, 198	
——— Sir Joshua, English painter, . . .	154

	PAGE
Reynolds, Sir Joshua, and the Royal Academy, . . .	156
Richard II., patron, . . .	39
Richter, Christian, eighteenth century miniaturist, English school, . . .	149
Robertson, Archibald and Alexander, nineteenth century English miniaturists, . . .	205
——— Andrew, nineteenth century English miniaturist, . . .	200
——— his friendship with Raeburn, . . .	201
——— his brother Archibald, . . .	201
——— in London, . . .	201
——— early miniatures, . . .	202
——— at the Academy school, . . .	202
——— Royal portraits, . . .	203
——— his style and methods, 203, 204, 205	
——— portrait of Charles Heath, 204	
Rochard, Simon Jacques, nineteenth century miniaturist, English school, 252	
——— François, brother, miniaturist, English school, . . .	252
Rogers, the poet, fragments of service-books in British Museum belonging to, . . .	47
Romanesque period, . . .	23
Romano, Giulio, sixteenth century Italian MS. miniaturist, master of Clovio, . . .	48
Rome, King of, portrait of, . . .	140
Romney, George, eighteenth century English painter, . . .	154
Ross, Hugh, nineteenth century English miniaturist, . . .	207
——— Sir William, nineteenth century English miniaturist, . . .	205
——— his early precocity, . . .	206
——— miniatures at Windsor, 206, 207	
——— prevailing fashions in dress, . . .	206
——— good qualities, . . .	207
Rouquet, André, eighteenth century French enameller, . . .	151, 281
——— his book on the arts, . . .	151
Rupert, Prince, Cooper's portrait of, 132	
 SACKVILLE, Richard, Earl of Dorset, portrait of, . . .	 111

MINIATURES

	PAGE		PAGE
Saddler, Thomas, English miniaturist, pupil of Lely,	136	Sire, Jehan, thirteenth century illuminator,	26
Saint, Daniel, early nineteenth century French miniaturist,	251	Sistine Chapel,	51
Saint-Luc, Academy of,	35	Soane Museum, 'Book of Hours,'	64
Sano di Petro, Sienese illuminator,	28	Society of Miniature Painters, the,	215, 224
San Petro, chapel of,	36	— — — — lack of prestige,	224
San Ruffino, monastery of,	51	— — — — a modern guild,	225
Santerre, eighteenth century French painter,	254	— — — — supervision of methods and materials,	225
School of Siena,	33	Society, Dilettante,	157
Schoreel, Jan, Italian painter, master of Sir Antonio More,	79	Sotheby, Major-General, collector,	85, 95, 104, 128
Scratchings on bones,	3	Southampton, Elizabeth, Countess of, portrait of,	129
Seuin, Peter Paul, seventeenth century French miniaturist,	241	Spencer, Lady, eighteenth century English miniaturist,	198
Severn, Joseph, nineteenth century English miniaturist and painter,	210	— Gervase, eighteenth century English miniaturist and enameller,	18, 148, 286
— — — — his success at the Academy schools,	210	— — — — enamel portrait of Admiral Byng,	286
— — — — his friendship with Keats,	210, 211	Spicer, Henry, eighteenth century English enameller,	290
— — — — miniature of Keats,	211, 212	Springinklee, Hans, German illuminator, etc., pupil of Dürer,	45
— — — — in Rome,	211, 212	St. Æthelwold, Bishop,	14
'Shrewsbury Book,' the, fifteenth century English MS. in British Museum,	39	Sta. Maria degli Angeli, school of MS. miniaturists,	36
Shelley, Samuel, eighteenth century English miniaturist,	168	St. Barbara, miniature of,	73
— — — — formation of the Royal Water-Colour Society,	168	St. Columba,	12
— — — — grouped portraits,	169	St. Columbian Monastery,	10
Sheriff, Charles, eighteenth century English miniaturist,	205	St. Cuthbert, the 'Durham Book,'	12
Shute, John, sixteenth century English miniaturist,	106	St. Maria del Carmine, church of,	36
Sicardi, Jean, eighteenth century French miniaturist,	251, 252	St. Martin, abbey of,	16
— — — — examples in the Wallace collection,	249	St. Swithin, founder of Winchester Scriptorium,	13
Sidney, Algernon, miniature of,	119, 120	St. Ursula, reliquary of,	64
— Mary, miniature of, Countess of Pembroke,	108	Stretes, Gwillim, sixteenth century Dutch painter and miniaturist,	92, 99
— Sir Philip, miniatures of,	110	— — — — his appointment to Edward VI., and salary,	100
Siena, Comune di, illuminations in the archives,	28	Stuart, Lady Arabella, miniature of,	113
Siena, school of,	44	Sussex, Thomas Ratcliffe, Earl of, miniature of,	104
Sienese miniaturists,	28	Symbolism in Christian art,	18
Simone, Martini, Sienese MS. miniaturist,	28		
Sinclair, Sir Tollemache, collector,	79	TADDEO GADDI, thirteenth century Italian MS. miniaturist,	26
		Talbot, John, Earl of Shrewsbury, the 'Shrewsbury Book' executed for,	39

INDEX

	PAGE		PAGE
Taylor, Edward, modern miniaturist,	217	VALKENBURG, family of, painters and	
Technical traditions,	226	miniaturists of Malines,	256
—— a new inspiration,	227	van Cleef, Justus, sixteenth century	
Teerlinck, Levina, sixteenth century		Netherlandish miniaturist,	92
miniaturist,	68, 72, 92	Vandyck, Anthony, copies from,	113
—— in the service of Edward VI.,	98	—— his influence on seven-	
Templetown, Lady, eighteenth cen-		teenth century miniaturists,	114
tury artist,	198	—— his miniatures,	122
'Tenison Psalter,' late thirteenth cen-		—— his influence on Cooper,	
tury English MS.,	24		122, 123
Terrestrial Paradise, miniature of,	56	—— revolutionises the methods	
'The little masters,'	45	of English portraiture,	131
Thienpondt, Carl Friedrich, eigh-		—— Walpole on Cooper and	
teenth century German enameller,	256	Vandyck,	132
Thorburn, Robert, nineteenth cen-		Vane, Sir Henry, portrait of,	134
tury English miniaturist,	213	Van Eyck, Hubert, early fifteenth	
—— his miniatures,	213	century Netherlandish painter,	31, 63
—— the advent of photo-		—— Jan, his brother,	31, 58
graphy,	213	—— his position as court	
Thornhill, Sir James, English painter,	154	painter,	64
Thouron, Jacques, eighteenth cen-		—— panel picture by,	64
tury Genevese enameller,	285	—— his signature,	80
Toba Sôjo, Japanese painter,	266	—— Margaretta,	31
—— his new style,	266	Van Leyden, Lucas, contemporary	
Tory, Geoffrey, sixteenth century		of Holbein,	86
French MS. miniaturist,	57, 59	Van Mander, writer,	86
Tosa, the school of,	266	Vauquer, Robert, seventeenth cen-	
—— its characteristics,	266, 267	tury French enameller, pupil of	
Toutin, Jean, sixteenth century		Toutin,	273
French enameller,	240, 272, 273	Vasari, writer,	25, 50, 98
—— Henry, his son,	273	Vasser, Anna, seventeenth century	
Treveth, Nicolas, thirteenth century		German miniaturist,	256
English MS. miniaturist,	26	Vatican Virgils, earliest classical	
Tsounetaka, Japanese painter,	266	miniatures, fourth century,	6
Tuke, Sir Bryan, Holbein portrait of,	84	Vellum,	23
Turrell, Charles, modern miniaturist,	215	—— purple stained,	5
—— in America,	215	Venevault, Nicholas, eighteenth cen-	
—— Royal portraits,	216	tury French miniaturist,	242
—— style reminiscent of		Venice, the art of,	33
Cosway,	216	Verona, fifteenth century school of,	44
UDNEY, Mrs., friend of Cosway,	185	Vertue, George, his researches,	157
—— miniature of,	198	Vestier, Antoine, eighteenth century	
Ulphilas, the fourth century purple		French painter and miniaturist,	254
vellum MS. of,	6	Villiers, Barbara, miniature of,	177
Universities founded in the twelfth		Von Leyden, Lucas, fifteenth century	
and thirteenth centuries,	22	Netherlandish painter,	60
Upsala, the MS. of Ulphilas pre-		WAAGEN, writer,	31
served at,	6	Wallace collection,	95
Utrecht Psalter, Anglo-Saxon features		Wallinc, William, master painter of	
in the,	20	Bruges,	68

MINIATURES

	PAGE		PAGE
Walpole, Horace, his chronicles, . . .	157	Women painters,	228
Walsingham, Sir Francis, miniature of, .	107	Wood, William, eighteenth century	
Wander Weyden, Roger, fifteenth		English miniaturist,	169
century Netherlandish painter, . . .	32	Worlidge, Thomas, eighteenth cen-	
Wareham, William, Archbishop of		tury English miniaturist,	148
Canterbury,	84		
Wells, H. T., nineteenth century		YORK, miniature of Anne Hyde,	
English painter and miniaturist, . .	217	Duchess of,	130
Wenman, Sir Philip, miniature of, . . .	111	— Duke of, miniature of (James	
Werner, Joseph, eighteenth century		II.),	128
Swiss miniaturist,	256		
Weyler, Jean Baptiste, enameller of		ZINCKE, Frederic, eighteenth century	
French school,	284	enameller, English school,	150, 283
Whitehall, pictures at,	152, 153	— — his purity of colour,	283
— fire at,	153	— — rivals Petitot,	284
White's chocolate-house, fire at, . . .	114	Zuccherò, Federigo, sixteenth century	
William of Devon, MS. miniaturist,		Italian painter and miniaturist, 56, .	107
thirteenth century, English school, .	26	— — miniature of William	
William III., portrait of,	140	Duckett,	108
Williams, Alyn, modern miniaturist, .	230	Zurich, Jean, eighteenth century	
Winchester, scriptoriums at,	13	enameller, contemporary with	
Wolsey, Cardinal, MS. portrait		Zincke,	151
of,	48		
Wolters, Henrietta, eighteenth cen-			
tury Netherlandish miniaturist, . .	256		

84-B21520



GETTY CENTER LIBRARY



3 3125 00714 6000

